

NOTES

As he does not become impure to bury a limb from one of his living relatives – שאינו מיטמא על אבר מן החי: Some commentaries reject the standard text of the Gemara, in favor of an alternative reading, which is similar to the aforementioned statement of Rabbi Yehuda (Commentary on Nazir). Others accept the standard version, and explain that Rabbi Yehuda means that a priest may handle a limb of his dead father when searching for it, i.e., while he is occupied with his father's burial (Commentary on Nazir).

לא, והיא רבי יהודה היא. דתניא, רבי יהודה אומר: לה מיטמא ואינו מיטמא לאבריה, שאינו מיטמא על אבר מן החי של אביו. אבל מיטמא הוא לאבר מן המת של אביו.

The Gemara answers: No, this presents no difficulty, as that *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda says: “For her he becomes impure” (Leviticus 21:3), this indicates that to bury her he becomes impure but he does not become impure to bury her limbs, as he does not become impure to bury a limb severed from one of his living relatives,<sup>8</sup> including that of his father. However, he does become impure to bury a limb from his dead father. Rav Hisda disagrees with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda and rules in accordance with the Rabbis, who maintain that a priest may become impure only to bury his relative’s whole body.

והתניא רב כהנא ברבי אליעזר בן יעקב: לה מיטמא. ואינו מיטמא לאברים – פרט לכזית מן המת, וכזית נצל, ומלא תרווד רקב.

The Gemara asks: But isn’t it taught in a *baraita* that Rav Kahana, son of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, said: The words “for her he becomes impure” (Leviticus 21:3) indicate that to bury her he becomes impure when she is whole, but he does not become impure to bury her limbs. This serves to exclude an olive-bulk of solid material from a corpse, and an olive-bulk of fluid from a corpse, and a full spade of dust from a corpse.

יכול לא יטמא לשדרה ולגולגולת, ולרוב בנינה ולרוב מנינה? כתוב “ואמרת אליהם” הוסיף לך הכתוב טומאה אחרת.

One might have thought that he may not become impure for a spine and a skull, or for most of the skeleton or most of the number of bones from his sister’s corpse. Therefore, it is written at the beginning of this passage dealing with the impurity of priests: “Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron, and say to them” (Leviticus 21:1). The repetition of “speak” and “say” indicates that the verse added a different form of impurity permitted to a priest.

Perek VI  
Daf 44 Amud a

BACKGROUND

Ginzak – גינזק: The Sages identify Ginzak as the biblical Gozan (1 Chronicles 5:26); however, the location of the city is unknown. Some explain that this is the ancient city Ganzak which stood south of Lake Urmia. Others hold that it is south of the Caspian Sea, while yet others maintain that it is in the vicinity of Nahrawan. Apparently, this Jewish center was isolated from the primary Jewish centers in Babylonia but was important enough for several noteworthy Sages and leaders to visit.

HALAKHA

When he is whole – בזמן שהוא שלם: A priest may not become impure to bury his father or any other relative who is missing a limb of any size. He may not gather his bones, even if the spine is intact, as he may become impure only to bury a whole body. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisda in the name of Rav, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Elisha and the Elders were there with him, indicating that this is a widely held opinion. Additionally, the fact that the Gemara notes that the Sages not only maintained this opinion on a theoretical basis, but acted in accordance with this opinion, also indicates that the ruling is in accordance with this opinion. Additionally, there is no record of any *amora* who expressly disagrees with the opinion of Rav Hisda (*Kesef Mishne*). Some commentaries (Ramban) maintain that this *halakha* does not apply to one who was missing a limb during his lifetime (Rambam *Sefer Shofetim, Hilkhot Evel* 2:15; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’a* 373:9).

יכול לא יטמא לשדרה ולגולגולת ולרוב בנינה ולרוב מנינה? אמרת: מה אחרות מיוחדת, שגופה תלוי בו, ומיטמא לשדרה ולגולגולת ולרוב בנינה ולרוב מנינה – אף כל שגופו תלוי בו מיטמא לשדרה ולגולגולת ולרוב בנינה ולרוב מנינה!

One might have thought that he may not become impure to bury a spine, or for a skull, or to bury most of the skeleton or most of the number of bones of other relatives for whom a priest becomes impure. You say in response: Just as his sister is unique in that her body is dependent upon the brother tending to her burial, and he becomes impure to bury a spine, or to bury a skull, or to bury most of her skeleton, or to bury most of her number of bones, so too, with regard to every person whose body is dependent upon him, i.e., his other close relatives, he becomes impure to bury a spine, or to bury a skull, or to bury most of his skeleton, or to bury most of his number of bones. This presents a difficulty for the opinion of Rav that a priest may not become impure to bury any relative whose head has been severed.

היא נמי רבי יהודה היא. ורב דאמר – בי האי תנא, דתניא: מעשה שמת אביו של רבי יצחק בגינזק, ובאו והודיעוהו לאחר שלש שנים, ובא ושאל את רבי יהושע בן אלישע וארבעה זקנים [שעמו].

The Gemara answers: That *baraita* also represents the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. And Rav stated his opinion in accordance with the opinion of this *tanna*, as it is taught in a *baraita*: An incident occurred in which the father of Rabbi Yitzhak the priest died in Ginzak,<sup>9</sup> and they came and informed him after three years had passed, and he came and asked Rabbi Yehoshua ben Elisha and four Elders who were with him whether he was permitted to become ritually impure by transferring his father’s remains to his ancestral grave, as was the custom.

ואמרו: “לאביו” – בזמן שהוא שלם, ולא בזמן שהוא חסר.

And they said to Rabbi Yitzhak that the verse states: “For his father” (Leviticus 21:2), which indicates a priest may become impure only when his father is whole,<sup>10</sup> and not when he is lacking. After three years the father’s body was certainly not whole, and therefore his son, a priest, was no longer permitted to become impure to bury him.

As impurity and shaving negate – **שְׁהִטְמוּאָה** וְהִתְגַּלְחַת סוֹתְרִין: A nazirite who becomes impure, whether purposely, by mistake, or even against his will, must negate his entire naziriteship. Likewise, if most of his head was shaved in any manner, even without his consent, he must add thirty days to his term of naziriteship to allow for sufficient hair growth (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:1–3).

But that which emerges from the vine does not negate – **וְהִיִּצָּא מִן הַגֶּפֶן אֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר** – A nazirite who eats or drinks any product of the vine does not negate any days of naziriteship (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:1).

As in the case of products that emerge from the vine nothing is exempted from its general prohibition – **שְׁהִיִּצָּא מִן הַגֶּפֶן לֹא הוֹתֵר מִכְּלָלוֹ** – A nazirite is permitted to become impure for a *met mitzva*. A nazirite who is a leper must perform the obligatory shaving of a leper. However, a nazirite is prohibited from drinking any type of wine, even for a mitzva. If one took an oath to drink wine and subsequently vowed to be a nazirite, his naziriteship goes into effect and overrides the oath. It is certainly prohibited for a nazirite to partake of wine for *kiddush* or *havdala*, as drinking wine while performing these mitzvot is obligatory only by rabbinic law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:11).

Obligatory shaving – **תְּגַלְחַת מִצְוָה** – A nazirite must perform obligatory shaving. In other words, if he contracts leprosy and recovers during his period of naziriteship, he is required to shave off all his hair (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:15).

A corpse with no one to bury it [*met mitzva*] – **מֵת** וְהִיִּצָּא מִן הַגֶּפֶן: A nazirite must become impure to bury a *met mitzva*. If he walks along the way and finds a corpse in a place where no one else is available to bury it, he must become impure and tend to its burial (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:14).

As impurity negates all – **שְׁהִטְמוּאָה סוֹתֵרֶת אֶת הַכֹּל** – If a nazirite becomes ritually impure, whether purposely, by mistake, or against his will, he negates his entire naziriteship. He must shave for his impurity and bring the offerings of an impure nazirite (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:3).

But shaving negates only thirty – **וְהִתְגַּלְחַת אֵינָה סוֹתֵרֶת** – **אֵלָּא שְׁלִשִׁים**: If most of a nazirite's head was shaved, he negates thirty days to enable hair growth, even if others shaved him against his will. After this period, he completes his term of naziriteship (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:1).

NOTES

To prohibit obligatory wine – **לְאַסוֹר יַיִן מִצְוָה**: One who took an oath to drink wine and subsequently undertook a vow of naziriteship may not drink wine, despite the fact that it was previously obligatory for him to do so.

**MISHNA** Three types of actions are prohibited for a nazirite: Contracting ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, and shaving his hair, and eating or drinking any substances that emerge from the vine. There is a greater stricture with regard to the prohibitions of impurity and shaving than that of substances that emerge from the vine, as impurity and shaving negate<sup>h</sup> his naziriteship, i.e., he must add thirty days to his term of naziriteship or start it afresh. But if he eats or drinks that which emerges from the vine, this does not negate<sup>h</sup> his naziriteship.

Conversely, there is a greater stricture with regard to substances that emerge from the vine than with regard to impurity and shaving, as in the case of products that emerge from the vine nothing is exempted from its general prohibition<sup>h</sup> in certain circumstances, i.e., there are no exceptions. But with regard to impurity and shaving certain cases are exempted from their general prohibition. For example, there are the cases of obligatory shaving,<sup>h</sup> e.g., a leper who was purified during his naziriteship, and of a corpse with no one to bury it [*met mitzva*].<sup>h</sup> A nazirite may tend to the burial of a *met mitzva*, despite the fact that he will thereby contract ritual impurity from a corpse.

The mishna adds: And there is a greater stricture with regard to impurity than with regard to shaving, as a nazirite's impurity negates all<sup>h</sup> his days of naziriteship and begins his term afresh, and he is liable to bring an offering for it, before starting his new term of naziriteship. But shaving negates only thirty<sup>h</sup> days at most, and he is not liable to bring an offering for it.

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks: And perhaps one should say that the ritual impurity of a nazirite should not be exempted from its general prohibition even for a *met mitzva*, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of wine: And if wine, whose prohibition is lighter, as it does not negate his naziriteship, is nevertheless not exempted from its general prohibition, then with regard to impurity, which is stringent, as it does negate his naziriteship, is it not logical that it should not be exempted from its general prohibition?

The Gemara answers: Therefore, the verse states, in addition to the general prohibition: “He shall not come near to a dead body” (Numbers 6:6), that: “For his father or his mother, for his brother or for his sister, he shall not become impure when they die” (Numbers 6:7). This verse teaches that it is to bury his father or for his mother that he may not become impure; however, he becomes impure to bury a *met mitzva*.

The Gemara suggests: If so, one can make the reverse argument. And let wine be exempted from its general prohibition due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of impurity: If impurity, which negates naziriteship, is exempted from its general prohibition; with regard to wine, which does not negate naziriteship, is it not logical that it should be exempted from its general prohibition for the sake of a mitzva, e.g., for one who took an oath to drink wine? The Gemara answers: It is for this reason that the verse states with regard to a nazirite: “He shall abstain from wine and strong drink” (Numbers 6:3). The emphasis on the words “wine and strong drink” comes to prohibit obligatory wine<sup>h</sup> like optional wine.

The Gemara further asks: And let wine negate all his days of naziriteship, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of impurity: If impurity, which is exempted from its general prohibition, negates all of his naziriteship, then with regard to wine, which is not exempted from its general prohibition, is it not all the more so logical that it should negate his entire naziriteship?

**מתני'** שלשה מינין אסורין בניזיר: שהטמאה, והתגלחת, והיציא מן הגפן. חומר בטומאה ובתגלחת מביציא מן הגפן, שהטמאה ובהתגלחת – סותרין, והיציא מן הגפן – אינו סותר.

חומר ביציא מן הגפן מבטומאה ובתגלחת, שהיציא מן הגפן – לא הותר מכללו, וטומאה ותגלחת – הותרו מכללן, בתגלחת מצוה ובמת מצוה.

וחומר בטומאה מבתגלחת, שהטמאה סותרת את הכל וחיובין עליה קרבן, ותגלחת אינה סותרת אלא שלשים, ואין חיובין עליה קרבן.

**גמ'** וטומאה לא הותר מכללה, קל וחומר מיין; ומה יין שאינו סותר לא הותר מכללו, וטומאה שסותרת – אינו דין שלא הותר מכללה?

תלמוד לומר “לְאָבִיו וּלְאִמּוֹ... לֹא יִטְמָא”, לְאָבִיו וּלְאִמּוֹ לֹא יִטְמָא – אֲבָל מִיִּטְמָא הוּא לְמַת מִצְוָה.

ויין יותר מכללו, קל וחומר מטומאה; מה טומאה שהיא סותרת הותרה מכללה, יין שאינו סותר – אינו דין שיותר מכללו? אָמַר קָרָא: “מִיַּיִן וּשְׂכָר יִזִּיר” – לְאַסוֹר יַיִן מִצְוָה בְּיַיִן רְשׁוּת.

ויין יסותר את הכל קל וחומר מטומאה; מה טומאה שהותרה מכללה סותרת את הכל, יין שלא הותר מכללו לא כל שכן שיתסור?

In which the one who renders another impure is not like the one who becomes impure – שלא עשו בה מטמא: כמיטמא: If one causes a nazirite to become impure, and the act was done with the intent of both he and the nazirite, the one who caused him to become impure has violated the prohibition “nor put a stumbling-block before the blind” (Leviticus 19:14), and the nazirite is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:20 and *Sefer Shofetim, Hilkhot Evel* 3:5).

The one who shaves is like the one who is shaved – עשו בה מגלח כמתגלח: If one intentionally, and with the consent of the nazirite, shaved a nazirite or tore out the hair from a nazirite’s head, they are both liable to receive lashes (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:11).

NOTES

To one who renders impure his consecrated head – לְמִטְמֵא רֹאשׁ נֹזֵר: The verse does not state: And his consecrated head shall be rendered impure for him, or: And they render him impure for his consecrated head (Rivan; Rabbi Avraham min HaHar), but: “And he renders impure his consecrated head,” which indicates that the prohibition refers only to the nazirite himself (Commentary on *Nazir*). Some commentaries maintain that this *halakha* is derived from the phrase “his consecrated head,” i.e., his naziriteship in which others have no share (Rosh).

Read into it that he shall not cause a razor to come upon – לֹא יַעֲבֹר הוּא: Some commentaries explain that it is as though the verse is read in two different ways, both as: Shall not come upon [*lo ya’avor*], and: Shall not cause to come upon [*lo ya’avir*] (Commentary on *Nazir*). Others explain simply that the verse does not say: A nazirite may not shave, but is written in the passive: “No razor shall come upon,” which indicates that the prohibition involves not only the nazirite himself, but anyone who performs the act, as no active party is mentioned (Rosh).

אָמַר קָרָא “וְהַיָּמִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים יִפְּלוּ בִּי טָמֵא נֹזֵר”, טוּמְאָה סוֹתֶרֶת, וְאִין הֵיִן סוֹתֵר.

וְהַתְּגַלְחָת תִּסְתּוֹר אֶת הַבֶּל קֵל וְחוֹמֵר מִטּוּמְאָה; וּמֵה טוּמְאָה שְׂלֵא עָשׂוּ בָּהּ מִטְּמֵא כְּמִיטְמֵא סוֹתֶרֶת אֶת הַבֶּל, תְּגַלְחָת שְׁעָשׂוּ בָּהּ מְגַלַּח כְּמִתְגַּלַּח – אֵינּוּ דִין שְׁתִּסְתּוֹר אֶת הַבֶּל?

אָמַר קָרָא “וְהַיָּמִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים יִפְּלוּ בִּי טָמֵא נֹזֵר” – טוּמְאָה סוֹתֶרֶת אֶת הַבֶּל, וְאִין תְּגַלְחָת סוֹתֶרֶת אֶת הַבֶּל.

וּטוּמְאָה נַעֲשֶׂה בָּהּ מִטְּמֵא כְּמִיטְמֵא, קֵל וְחוֹמֵר מִתְּגַלְחָת; וּמֵה תְּגַלְחָת שְׂאִינָה סוֹתֶרֶת אֶלֶּא שְׁלִשִׁים עֶשְׂרֵה בָּהּ מְגַלַּח כְּמִתְגַּלַּח, טוּמְאָה שְׂהִיא סוֹתֶרֶת אֶת הַבֶּל – אֵינּוּ דִין שְׁנַעֲשֶׂה בָּהּ מִטְּמֵא כְּמִיטְמֵא?

אָמַר קָרָא “וְטָמֵא רֹאשׁ נֹזֵר” – לְמִטְמֵא רֹאשׁ נֹזֵר.

וְתְּגַלְחָת לֹא נַעֲשֶׂה בָּהּ מְגַלַּח כְּמִתְגַּלַּח, קֵל וְחוֹמֵר מִטּוּמְאָה; וּמֵה טוּמְאָה שְׂהִיא סוֹתֶרֶת אֶת הַבֶּל לֹא עָשׂוּ בָּהּ מִטְּמֵא כְּמִיטְמֵא, תְּגַלְחָת שְׂאִינָה סוֹתֶרֶת אֶלֶּא שְׁלִשִׁים יוֹם – לֹא כָּל שְׁבֹן שְׂלֵא נַעֲשֶׂה מְגַלַּח כְּמִתְגַּלַּח?

אָמַר קָרָא “תַּעֲר לֹא יַעֲבֹר עַל רֹאשׁוֹ”, קָרִי בִּיה: לֹא יַעֲבֹר הוּא, וְלֹא יַעֲבֹר לְאַחֵר.

וְתְּגַלְחָת לֹא תוֹתֵר מִכְּלָלָהּ, קֵל וְחוֹמֵר מִיֵּין; וּמֵה יֵיִן שְׂאִינּוּ סוֹתֵר לֹא הוֹתֵר מִכְּלָלוֹ, תְּגַלְחָת שְׁפוֹתֶרֶת – אֵינּוּ דִין שְׂלֵא תוֹתֵר מִכְּלָלָהּ? אָמַר רַחֲמֵנָא “רֹאשׁוֹ” וְאָמַר רַחֲמֵנָא “זְקָנוֹ”.

The Gemara answers: Therefore, the verse states: “But the former days shall be void, for his naziriteship was rendered impure” (Numbers 6:12). The phrase “for his naziriteship was rendered impure” is apparently redundant, as it is clear from the context that the verse is referring to an impure nazirite. Rather, this teaches that only impurity negates his naziriteship, and wine does not negate it.

The Gemara continues to ask along the same lines: **And let shaving negate all his naziriteship**, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of impurity: **And if in the case of impurity, in which the one who renders another impure is not like the one who becomes impure,**<sup>h</sup> i.e., one who renders a nazirite ritually impure does not perform a transgression, as only the nazirite who contracts the impurity has performed a transgression, impurity nevertheless negates all his naziriteship; then with regard to shaving, in which the one who shaves is like the one who is shaved,<sup>h</sup> as someone who shaves a nazirite also performs a transgression, is it not logical that it should negate all his naziriteship?

The Gemara answers: Therefore, the verse states: “But the former days shall be void, for his naziriteship was rendered impure” (Numbers 6:12). The emphasis on the phrase “for his naziriteship was rendered impure” teaches that **impurity negates all, and shaving does not negate all.**

The Gemara suggests: **But** in that case, one can argue the opposite: With regard to impurity, **let the one who renders another impure be like the one who becomes impure**, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of shaving: **If in the case of shaving, which negates only thirty days, the one who shaves is like the one who is shaved;** then, with regard to impurity, which negates all, is it not logical that the one who renders another impure should be like the one who becomes impure?

The Gemara responds: Therefore, the verse states: “And if any man dies very suddenly beside him, and he renders impure his consecrated head” (Numbers 6:9). This teaches that the prohibition of impurity applies only to one who renders impure his consecrated head,<sup>n</sup> but not to others who render him impure.

The Gemara suggests: **But** if so, one can say the reverse: **And** with regard to shaving, **let the one who shaves not be like the one who is shaved**, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of impurity: **And if in the case of impurity, which is stringent in that it negates all his naziriteship, the one who renders another impure is nevertheless not like the one who becomes impure;** then with regard to shaving, which negates only thirty days, is it not all the more so logical that one who shaves should not be like the one who is shaved?

The Gemara answers: Therefore, the verse states: “No razor shall come upon his head” (Numbers 6:5). Since the verse is written in the passive, **read into** the verse that **he**, the nazirite himself, shall not cause a razor to come upon<sup>n</sup> his head; and read the verse as also referring to any other person, who shall not cause a razor to come upon the nazirite’s head.

The Gemara asks: **And let shaving not be exempted from its general prohibition** in the case of a leper, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of wine: **And if wine, which does not negate naziriteship, is not exempted from its general prohibition;** then, with regard to shaving, which does negate naziriteship, is it not logical that it should not be exempted from its general prohibition? The Gemara answers: Therefore, the Merciful One states with regard to a leper: “That he shall shave all his hair,” and adds: “Off his head” (Leviticus 14:9). **And the Merciful One further states: “And his beard,”** which teaches that he shaves despite the prohibition of naziriteship.

ותגלחת לא תסתור כלל, קל וחומר מין; ומה יין שלא הותר מכללו אינו סותר, תגלחת שהותרה מכללה – אינו דין שלא תסתור? בענין גידול שער, והא ליכא.

ויין וסתור שלשים יום, קל וחומר מתגלחת; ומה תגלחת שהותרה מכללה סותרת, יין שלא הותר מכללו – אינו דין שישתור? מידי הוא טעמא אלא משום גידול שער, גבי יין – הא קאים שער.

The Gemara proposes the reverse argument: **And let shaving not negate naziriteship at all**, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of wine: **And if wine, which is not exempted from its general prohibition, does not negate naziriteship**; then with regard to shaving, which is exempted from its general prohibition, is it not logical that it should not negate naziriteship? The Gemara answers: **We require hair growth, and there is none** at that point. Consequently, the nazirite must necessarily wait until his hair is of sufficient length to shave.

The Gemara asks: **And let wine negate thirty days**, due to an *a fortiori* inference from the prohibition of shaving: **And if shaving, which is exempted from its general prohibition, nevertheless negates thirty days**; then with regard to wine, which is not exempted from its general prohibition, is it not logical that it should negate thirty days? The Gemara answers: **As that reason** for the *halakha* that shaving causes a nazirite to negate thirty days is **only due to hair growth**, so that he has sufficient hair at the end of his naziriteship to shave, the *halakha* does not apply with regard to wine, since **his hair remains** in place. The nazirite himself has not changed, so the fact that he has drunk wine is not sufficient reason to negate any time.

Perek VI  
Daf 44 Amud b

**מתני'** תגלחת טומאה ביצד? היתה מזה בשלישי ובשביעי, ומגלח בשביעי, ומביא קרבנותיו בשמיני. ואם גילח בשמיני – מביא קרבנותיו בו ביום, דברי רבי עקיבא. אומר ליה רבי טרפון: מה בין זה למצורע?

אמר ליה: זה – טהרתו תלויה בימיו, ומצורע טהרתו תלויה בתגלחתו, ואינו מביא קרבן אלא אם כן היה מעורב שמש.

**MISHNA** With regard to the shaving of ritual impurity performed by a nazirite who became impure during his naziriteship, **how is it performed?**<sup>M</sup> The priest would sprinkle the waters of purification on him **on the third and the seventh days** after he contracted his impurity, as performed for all those who contracted impurity imparted by a corpse. **And he shaves his hair on the seventh day and brings his offerings on the eighth day. And if he shaved on the eighth day he brings his offerings on that day**, this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. **Rabbi Tarfon said to him: What is the difference between this ritual and that of a leper?**<sup>N</sup> A leper also shaves on the seventh day and sacrifices his offerings on the eighth. However, if a leper shaves on the eighth day he brings his offerings on the ninth day, not on the day of his shaving.

Rabbi Akiva said to him: **The purification of this impure nazirite depends on his days**, as he immerses on the seventh day like all those who contract impurity imparted by a corpse, which means he is already ritually pure on the eighth day. **But with regard to a leper, his purification depends on his shaving.**<sup>H</sup> Any immersion performed earlier is of no account, and must be repeated. **And a leper brings his offering only if<sup>I</sup> the sun has set** following his immersion. Since offerings are not sacrificed at night, the bringing of his offering is postponed until the following day.

HALAKHA

**תגלחת – טהרתו תלויה בימיו** – טומאה ביצד: If a nazirite contracted impurity imparted by a corpse, he is sprinkled with the waters of purification on the third and seventh days of his impurity, he shaves the hair off his head on the seventh day, and he subsequently immerses on the seventh day, after the sprinkling, like anyone who contracts impurity imparted by a corpse. He then waits for sunset, and brings his offerings on the eighth day. If he shaved on the eighth day, he sacrifices his offerings on the same day. These offerings are two turtledoves or young pigeons, one for a sin-offering and the other for a burnt-offering, and a sheep in its first year for a guilt-offering. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:11).

**טהרתו תלויה בתגלחתו** – מצורע טהרתו תלויה בתגלחתו: The Rambam explains that the shaving, immersion, and sprinkling of a leper are not interdependent. However, the Ra'avad points out that this ruling is the reverse of the statement of the mishna and of other sources. Therefore, some commentaries explain that although each of these activities does not invalidate the performance of the other parts of the ritual, the leper must shave in order to attain ritual purity (*Kesef Mishne*). The Rambam similarly states in *Sefer HaMitzvot*, positive mitzva 111, that the purification of a leper is complete when he shaves, and it is only at this stage that he ceases to impart impurity to the degree of a dead creeping animal (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Tumat Tzara'at* 11:4).

NOTES

**מה – בין זה למצורע**: What is the difference between this and a leper? Most commentaries explain that a leper never brings his offerings on the day he shaves, even if it was the eighth day of his purification. Rather, on the following day he immerses and sacrifices his offerings. This is the basis for Rabbi Tarfon's question with regard to the difference between a nazirite and a leper. Rabbi Akiva answers that this difference results from the respective times suitable for their immersions. Since a leper may immerse only after he has shaved, he brings his offerings the next day.

However, other commentaries present an entirely different explanation, based on variant versions of this discussion in the *Torat Kohanim*. According to these commentaries, Rabbi Akiva maintains that even a leper who shaved on the eighth day brings his offerings on that day. Therefore, Rabbi Tarfon is not asking why there is a difference between a nazirite and a leper in this regard. Rather, Rabbi Tarfon is asking whether there is any difference at all between the two cases. Rabbi Akiva answers that there is a relevant difference for *halakha* between the purifications of a nazirite and a leper, with regard to whether this purification is merely tied to the act of shaving, as in the case of a leper, or whether it is also dependent on his days of impurity (Commentary on *Nazir*).

**ואינו מביא קרבן – אלא אם כן**: Some commentaries maintain that the *halakha* that requires waiting until sunset applies only to a nazirite, not to a leper (Commentary on *Nazir*). Other commentaries maintain that this statement is referring to a leper, and it is the continuation of the previous ruling, as it serves to explain why a leper may bring his offerings only on the ninth day if he shaves on the eighth. It has been pointed out that even according to this interpretation one can explain that this clause of the mishna refers even to a nazirite, since a nazirite must also bring his offerings in a state of purity, after having immersed the day before, as indicated by Rava's statement in the Gemara (Rambam).

In this case a nazirite who immersed on the seventh day – **הָא דְטָבַל בְּשַׁבְּעֵי**: An impure nazirite who was sprinkled with the waters of purification on the third and seventh days but has not yet immersed must immerse on that day and wait until sunset. He brings his offerings on the following day (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:13).

PERSONALITIES

Rav Natan bar Hoshaya – **רַב נָתָן בַּר הוֹשַׁעְיָא**: A Babylonian *amora* of the second and third generation of *amora'im*, Rav Natan bar Hoshaya, also known as Rav Natan bar Oshaya, was a colleague of Rav Yehuda and Rav Hilda. He emigrated to Eretz Yisrael, where he became a disciple of Rabbi Yohanan and a colleague of Rabbi Elazar. Apparently, he lived a very long life, at the end of which he returned to Babylonia to study with the Sages of the fourth generation of *amora'im*, including Abaye. The expression: The assembly of Rav Natan, suggests that he was the head of an academy that may have endured even after his passing. Abaye engages in discussion with this assembly here.

**גַּמְ' קִיבְּלָהּ מִיּוֹמָהּ אִי לֹא תָא שְׂמַע, דְּתַנִּי הִלֵּל: גִּילְתָּ בְּשַׁמְיָנִי – מִבֵּיא קְרִבְנוֹתָיו בְּתַשְׁעֵי. וְאִי סִלְקָא דְעֵתָךְ קִיבְּלָהּ מִיּוֹמָהּ לִיתִי קְרִבְנוֹתָיו בְּשַׁמְיָנִי!**

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks: Did Rabbi Tarfon accept this claim from Rabbi Akiva, or did he not accept it? **Come and hear** an answer to this from **that** which Hillel the *amora* taught: **If a nazirite shaved on the eighth day, he brings his offerings on the ninth. And if it should enter your mind that Rabbi Tarfon accepted the claim from Rabbi Akiva, let the nazirite bring his offerings on the eighth day itself, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.** Rather, this *baraita* is certainly in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Tarfon, who remains steadfast in his rejection of Rabbi Akiva's opinion.

**אָמַר רַבָּא: לֹא קִשְׁיָא: הָא – דְטָבַל בְּשַׁבְּעֵי, הָא – דְלֹא טָבַל בְּשַׁבְּעֵי.**

Rava said: This is **not difficult**, i.e., it is possible that Rabbi Tarfon accepted Rabbi Akiva's opinion with regard to a nazirite who shaved on the eighth day, and there is a difference between the two statements: **In this case of the mishna, it is referring to a nazirite who immersed on the seventh day,**<sup>h</sup> which means that he is entirely pure on the eighth and can therefore bring his offerings on the same day after shaving. By contrast, in **that case of Hillel's baraita, it is referring to one who did not immerse on the seventh.** Consequently, as he immerses on the eighth day he may sacrifice his offerings only after sunset, on the ninth day.

**אָמַר אַבְיִי: אֲשַׁבַּחְתִּינְהוּ לְחַבְרִיָּה דְרַב נָתָן בַּר הוֹשַׁעְיָא דִּיתְבִּין וְקָאָמְרִין: "וּבָא לִפְנֵי ה' אֶל פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וַיִּנְתֵּן אֵל הַכֹּהֵן, אֵימָתִי הוּא [בָּא]? בְּזִמְן שְׁהוּא טָבַל וְעָשָׂה הָעֵרֶב שְׂמֵשׁ – אִין, לֹא טָבַל וְעָשָׂה הָעֵרֶב שְׂמֵשׁ – לֹא.**

**Abaye said: I encountered the members of the assembly of Rav Natan bar Hoshaya<sup>p</sup> sitting and saying** the following: The verse states with regard to a man who experiences a gonorrhea-like discharge [*zav*] who immerses on the seventh day of his purification: **“And on the eighth day he shall take for himself two turtledoves or two young pigeons and come before the Lord to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting and give them to the priest”** (Leviticus 15:14). **When does he come to the courtyard to sacrifice his offerings? Only when he has immersed on the seventh day and performed the requirement to wait until sunset.** In that case, **yes**, he brings his offerings, but if he **has not immersed and has not performed the requirement to wait until sunset, no**, he may not enter the courtyard.

**אֲלֵמָא קְסָבַר: טְבוּל יוֹם שֶׁל זָב בְּזָב דְּמִי.**

Apparently, this *tanna* maintains that **one who immersed himself that day to release himself from the status of a zav<sup>n</sup> is considered like an actual zav.** Just as a *zav* is prohibited from entering the Levite camp in his state of impurity, the same applies to him on the day of his immersion, as he must wait until after sunset, when he is entirely pure.

**אָמַינָא לְהוֹן אַנָּא: אֲלֵא מַעַתָּה, גַּבִּי נוֹר טָמֵא נְמִי, דְּכָתִיב "וְהֵבִיא אוֹתָם) אֶל הַכֹּהֵן אֶל פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד" אֵימָתִי הוּא [בָּא] – בְּזִמְן שְׁטָבַל וְעָשָׂה הָעֵרֶב שְׂמֵשׁ:**

Abaye adds: Upon hearing this, **I said to those Sages: If that is so, with regard to an impure nazirite too, as it is written: And he shall bring them**, referring to the verse **“And on the eighth day he shall bring two turtledoves or two young pigeons to the priest, to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting”** (Numbers 6:10), this can be explained in a similar manner: **When does he come to the courtyard to sacrifice his offerings? When he has immersed himself and performed the requirement to wait until sunset.**

NOTES

**One who immersed himself that day to release himself from the status of a zav – טְבוּל יוֹם שֶׁל זָב:** As specified in the alternative versions of the text, a *zav* would come to the Gate of Nicanor, which was an entrance to the Temple courtyard that was not considered part of the camp of the Divine Presence, where one lacking atonement was not permitted to enter, but rather, was part of the Levite camp. One cannot say that the reason this *zav* who had immersed himself is prohibited from entering the Levite camp until sunset is due to the fact that one who immersed himself that day is not completely purified from his impurity, as the *halakha* is that one who immersed himself that day from the more severe impurity of a corpse is permitted to enter the Levite camp (see 45a). Rather, these Sages understood that there must be a particular stringency with regard to a *zav* who immersed himself that day, that he retains the status of a *zav* until sunset. The reason for this is that his impurity does not stem from an external source, but emerges from his own body (*Tosafot*; Rosh).