

מְבָדֵי שַׁעֲרֵי נִקְנֹר הֵיכָא קַיִמִין –
בְּשַׁעֲרֵי לְוִיָּה,

וְהִתְנַיָּא: טָמֵא מֵת מוֹתֵר לִיבְנִים
בְּמַחְנֵה לְוִיָּה, וְלֹא טָמֵא מֵת בְּלִבְדוֹ
אֲלֵא אֶפְלוֹ מֵת עֲצָמוֹ, שְׁנֵאמֵר "וַיִּקַּח
מֹשֶׁה אֶת עֲצָמוֹת יוֹסֵף עִמּוֹ" – מֵאֵי
"עִמּוֹ"? עִמּוֹ בְּמַחְצוֹתָו, עִמּוֹ בְּמַחְנֵה
לְוִיָּה!

אֲלֵא (אָמַר אַבְיִי): טָבוֹל יוֹם שָׁלֹשׁ
כִּיב דְּמֵי, וְאֶפְלוֹ הֵכֵי, בִּיּוֹן דְּמַחוּסָר
כְּפָרָה – לֹא עָיִיל.

Abaye continues: **Now consider the Gate of Nicanor,^{BN}** where all those lacking atonement stand to bring their offerings; **where is it located? In the gates of the Levites.** Three camps are detailed in the verses, each having its own restrictions as to who may or may not enter them (see Numbers, chapter 5). The verses speak of the camps of the Jewish people in the wilderness, and the Sages taught that the statuses of certain areas of Jerusalem corresponded to those camps. The camps in the wilderness were the Israelite camp, the Levite camp, and the camp of the Divine Presence. They correspond to Jerusalem, the Temple Mount, and the Temple itself. The Gate of Nicanor had the status of the Levite camp.

Abaye continues: **But isn't it taught in a baraita (Tosefta, Kelim 1:8)** that one who is **impure** due to contact with a **corpse** is **permitted^d to enter the Levite camp; and not only one impure from a corpse, but even a corpse itself** may be brought inside the Levite camp, as it is stated: **"And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him"** (Exodus 13:19). The *baraita* explains: **What is the meaning of "with him"?** The phrase **"with him"** indicates that Joseph's bones were taken **within Moses's boundary, with him in the Levite camp.** This demonstrates that even a corpse may be brought into the Levite camp. If so, certainly a nazirite who was impure from contact with a corpse and who has been sprinkled and immersed may enter there. Consequently, the *halakha* that a nazirite must wait until the eighth day to sacrifice his offerings cannot be due to a prohibition against entering the Gate of Nicanor. One can similarly infer that the *halakha* that a *zav* who has immersed may not bring his offerings before the eighth day is not because he is prohibited from entering the Gate of Nicanor.

Rather, Abaye says:^N The *baraita* should be understood slightly differently than suggested by the assembly of Rav Natan bar Hoshaya: **One who immersed himself that day** to release himself from the status of a *zav*, i.e., a full-fledged *zav*, who experienced three emissions, not merely two, **is considered like a *zav*** with regard to the prohibition against entering the Levite camp. **But the reason for this prohibition is not that a *zav* who immersed himself that day may not enter the Levite camp. Rather, granted that he is permitted to enter the Levite camp in terms of his impurity, even so, since he is lacking atonement, as he has yet to sacrifice his offerings, he may not enter the Levite camp.**

BACKGROUND

The Gate of Nicanor – שַׁעֲרֵי נִקְנֹר: The Gate of Nicanor was famous for several reasons, including the splendid copper artistry of its doors and the miracles surrounding their arrival from Egypt (see *Yoma* 38a). This gate, situated at the entrance to the Israelite courtyard of the Temple, was often used as a standing area by people who needed to be as close as possible to the courtyard without actually entering the sanctified area.



Image of the Gate of Nicanor

HALAKHA

One who is impure due to contact with a corpse is permitted, etc. – טָמֵא מֵת מוֹתֵר וכו' – A corpse may be brought onto the Temple Mount, an area that corresponds to the Levite camp in the desert. This is all the more so true for one who was impure due to contact with a corpse; he may enter the Levite camp (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Beit HaBehira* 7:15 and *Hilkhoh Biat HaMikdash* 3:4).

NOTES

The Gate of Nicanor – שַׁעֲרֵי נִקְנֹר: This gate, which was the main entrance to the Israelite courtyard from the women's courtyard in the east, did not have the sanctity of the Israelite courtyard itself. Instead, it had the lesser sanctity of the rest of the Temple Mount. Consequently, it is considered part of the Levite camp. The halakhic statuses in the configuration of the Temple were based on the encampment of the Jewish people in the wilderness, which was composed of three camps. The Israelite camp corresponds to the city of Jerusalem outside the Temple Mount and, according to many authorities, all walled cities in Eretz Yisrael. The Levite camp, the area where the Levites encamped around the Tabernacle, corresponds to the Temple Mount, with its courtyards and structures, up to the main courtyard. The camp of the Divine Presence was the Tent of Meeting in the Tabernacle, and corresponds to the Temple itself in Jerusalem, including the Israelite courtyard.

Rather, Abaye says – אֲלֵא אָמַר אַבְיִי: The early commentaries present various versions of this passage, which have significant implications for the passage as a whole. Most commentaries preferred a different version of the text to the one presented

here. Many variant versions omit the phrase: Rather, Abaye says, and have instead: Actually (Commentary on *Nazir*), indicating that the statement: One who immersed himself that day to release himself from the status of a *zav* is like a *zav*, is the response of the assembly of Rav Natan bar Hoshaya to Abaye. In their opinion, a *zav* who immersed that day is like a *zav* with regard to all matters, and they also maintain that a nazirite cannot sacrifice his offerings before sunset if he is impure. However, they claim that the reason in both cases is not because he has not yet had the sun set following his immersion, but due to the fact that he lacks atonement. According to this opinion, although ordinary people who have contracted impurity from a corpse may enter the Levite camp, a nazirite is prohibited from doing so, as he lacks atonement until he brings his offerings of purity.

Other commentaries have a version of the texts that reads: Rather, Abaye says that one who immersed himself that day to release himself from the status of a *zav* is not like a *zav*, as he would be permitted to enter if his impurity was merely that of a *zav*. The reason that the *baraita* prohibits him from entering further than the Gate of Nicanor is that this *zav* experienced three

emissions. Consequently, he is obligated to bring offerings, which means that he lacks atonement. By contrast, although a nazirite who contracts impurity imparted by a corpse is also obligated to sacrifice offerings, he is not referred to as lacking in atonement, as that term refers only to one whose impurity stems from his own body, e.g., a *zav* or a leper, not one who was rendered impure from an external source (*Tosafot*).

There are commentaries who uphold the version of the text as it stands: Rather, Abaye said, one who immersed himself that day to release himself from the status of a *zav* is considered like a *zav*, and he may not enter the camp of the Divine Presence. They explain, in a somewhat forced manner, that this does not refer to all types of *zavim*, but only to one who saw three emissions and is obligated to bring an offering. The reason that he is prohibited from entering is not his status as a *zav* but the fact that he lacks atonement (*Shita Mekubbetzet*). According to these last two interpretations, Abaye's rebuttal is based on the difference between a *zav* who saw two emissions and one who experienced three, as well as the difference between one whose impurity stems from his own body and one who was rendered impure from an external source, as explained above.

And if he is standing in the Levite camp – וְאִם בְּמַחֲנֵה לְוִיִּיה קָא קְרִי לְוִיִּיה קָא: This statement serves to explain why the Gate of Nicanor is called the entrance to the Tent of Meeting, which apparently refers to the camp of the Divine Presence (Commentary on *Nazir*).

And he slaughters the peace-offering – וְשׁוּחַט אֶת הַשְּׁלָמִים: Many commentaries maintain that Rabbi Yehuda says that a nazirite first slaughters the peace-offering and then shaves his hair (*Tosafot*; see Commentary on *Nazir*). However, this interpretation raises several difficulties, both with regard to the language of the Torah and the wording of the mishna, and with regard to the *halakha* itself. Others apparently maintain that everyone agrees that the animals are slaughtered in the order stated in the Torah and the mishna: First the sin-offering, then the burnt-offering, and finally the peace-offering. They disagree only over whether the shaving is linked to the sin-offering or the peace-offering (see *Tosefot Yom Tov* and *Melekheth Shlomo*).

וְאִם בְּמַחֲנֵה לְוִיִּיה קָא קְרִי לְוִיִּיה קָא: מִה הֵתָם מְחוֹסֵר כְּפָרָה לֹא עֵייל, אִף לְמַחֲנֵה לְוִיִּיה נְמוּ – מְחוֹסֵר כְּפָרָה לֹא עֵייל.

וְהֵתָם מִנֵּן? דְּתַנֵּינָא: “טָמֵא יִהְיֶה” – לְרַבּוֹת טָבוּל יוֹם. “עוֹד טוֹמְאָתוֹ בּוֹ” – לְרַבּוֹת מְחוֹסֵר כְּפָרָה.

מִתַּנֵּי תְּגַלְחַת הַטְּהָרָה כִּיצַד? הִיא מִבֵּיא שְׁלֹשׁ בְּהֵמוֹת, חֲטָאת עוֹלָה וְשְׁלָמִים, וְשׁוּחַט אֶת הַשְּׁלָמִים וּמְגַלַּח עֲלֵיהֶם, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה. רַבִּי אֱלֵעָזָר אוֹמֵר: לֹא הִיא מְגַלַּח אֶלָּא עַל הַחֲטָאת, שֶׁהַחֲטָאת קוֹדֶמֶת בְּכֹל מְקוֹם. וְאִם גִּלַּח עַל אַחַת מִשְׁלֹשָׁתָן – יִצָּא.

Abaye elaborates: The reason he may not enter is that the Torah states with regard to a *zav*: “And he shall come before the Lord to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting” (Leviticus 15:14), and if he is standing in the Levite camp,ⁿ at the Gate of Nicanor, when he brings his offerings, why does the Torah call it “the Tent of Meeting”? Rather, this verse must be coming to say: Just as there, with regard to the Tent of Meeting itself, i.e., the camp of the Divine Presence, one who is lacking atonement may not enter there, so too, with regard to the Levite camp as well, one who is lacking atonement may not enter there.

The Gemara asks: And from where do we derive that one who lacks atonement may not enter there, i.e., the camp of the Divine Presence? The Gemara answers: As it is taught in a *baraita*: The Torah states with regard to the prohibition against an impure person entering the Tabernacle: “He shall be impure; his impurity is yet upon him” (Numbers 19:13). The phrase “he shall be impure” serves to include one who immersed himself that day^h in the prohibition against entering the Temple. “His impurity is yet upon him” serves to include one who lacks atonement,^h who is prohibited from entering the camp of the Divine Presence until he has sacrificed his offerings of purity.

MISHNA With regard to a nazirite’s shaving of purity^h after the completion of his term of naziriteship, how is it performed? He would bring three animals: One for a sin-offering, one for a burnt-offering, and one for a peace-offering. And he slaughters the peace-offering^{nh} and shaves his hair after he slaughters them. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar says: He would shave only after he slaughtered the sin-offering, as the sin-offering precedes the other offerings in all places, and therefore he sacrifices the sin-offering first. He shaves his hair after he slaughters this offering. And if he shaved after the sacrifice of any one of the three of them,^h he has fulfilled his obligation after the fact.

HALAKHA

לְרַבּוֹת טָבוּל יוֹם – To include one who immersed himself that day – It is prohibited for one who immersed himself that day to enter the women’s courtyard in the Temple. This *halakha* applies by rabbinic law, as by Torah law he may enter that area, which has the status of the Levite camp (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 7:17 and *Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 3:6).

לְרַבּוֹת מְחוֹסֵר כְּפָרָה – To include one who lacks atonement – It is prohibited for one who lacks atonement to enter the Israelite courtyard in the Temple, which corresponds to the camp of the Divine Presence in the desert. The reason is that this individual has not yet been completely purified (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 3:7).

תְּגַלְחַת הַטְּהָרָה – Shaving of purity – Upon the completion of his term of naziriteship, the nazirite brings three animals for his shaving of purity: A male lamb for a burnt-offering, a female lamb for a

sin-offering, and a ram for a peace-offering (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:1).

שׁוּחַט אֶת הַשְּׁלָמִים – He slaughters the peace-offering – One who completed his naziriteship in a state of purity first slaughters his sin-offering, then his burnt-offering, and finally his peace-offering, after which he shaves. The commentaries explain that this ruling is a compromise between the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, who maintains that the sin-offering takes precedence, and the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda that he shaves after the peace-offering (*Kesef Mishne*). Some authorities maintain that the two *tanna’im* do not disagree in this regard (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:2).

וְאִם גִּלַּח עַל אַחַת – If he shaved after one of the three of them – מִשְׁלֹשָׁתָן: If a nazirite shaved after slaughtering his sin-offering or burnt-offering, without waiting until after he slaughtered his peace-offering, he has fulfilled his obligation (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:2).

If he brought three animals without specifying – **הביא שלש בהמות ולא פירש**: If a nazirite brought three animals without specifying which animal is for which offering, the one that is suitable for a sin-offering is for a sin-offering, the animal suitable for a burnt-offering is for a burnt-offering, and the one that is suitable as a peace-offering is sacrificed as a peace-offering (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:1).

רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: הביא שלש בהמות ולא פירש, הראויה לתטאת – תקרב חטאת, לעולה – תקרב עולה, לשלמים – תקרב שלמים.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If a nazirite brought three animals without specifying^h which of them was for which offering, the one that is fit for a sin-offering, i.e., a female sheep in its first year, is sacrificed as a sin-offering; that which is fit for a burnt-offering, a male sheep in its first year, is sacrificed as a burnt-offering; and that which is fit for a peace-offering, a ram, i.e., a male sheep over the age of one year, is sacrificed as a peace-offering.

גמ' תנו רבנן: "וגלח הנזיר פתח אהל מועד" וגו' – בשלמים הכתוב מדבר, שנאמר "ושחטו פתח אהל מועד".

GEMARA The Gemara first addresses the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, whose reasoning was not stated in the mishna. **The Sages taught** that when the Torah states: **"And the nazirite shall shave his consecrated head at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting"** (Numbers 6:18), **the verse is speaking of the peace-offering**, as the phrase "the entrance to the Tent of Meeting" alludes to a peace-offering, as it is stated: **"And if his offering is a sacrifice of peace-offering... and he shall slaughter it at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting"** (Leviticus 3:1–2).

אתה אומר בשלמים הכתוב מדבר, או אינו אלא פתח אהל מועד ממש? אמרת: אם בן דרך ביזיון הוא.

Do you say the verse is speaking of the peace-offering, i.e., that the nazirite shaves after bringing his peace-offering? Or perhaps it is only teaching that he shaves at the actual entrance to the Tent of Meeting, at the gate to the Sanctuary, as indicated by a literal reading of the verse? You can say in response: **If so, that is a degrading manner** of service, to shave at the entrance to the Sanctuary.

רבי יאשיה אומר: אינו צריך, הרי אמרה תורה "לא תעלה במעלות על מזבחי" קל וחומר לדרך ביזיון.

Rabbi Yoshiya says: This proof is not necessary,ⁿ as the Torah states: **"And you shall not ascend by steps to My altar, so that you should not reveal your nakedness upon it"** (Exodus 20:23). If the Torah is concerned about the disrespect to the altar presented by normal human behavior, then by an *a fortiori* inference the Torah prohibits acting in a degrading manner by shaving at the entrance to the Sanctuary.

[נ"א במדרש בפרשה נשא (דף מאתים ארבעים ושנים): "וגלח הנזיר", רבי יאשיה אומר: בשלמים הכתוב מדבר, או אינו וכו', אם כך אמרה תורה "לא תעלה" וכו', קל וחומר לדרך ביזיון אלא בשלמים הכתוב מדבר.]

A different version of this derivation is stated in the midrash to the Torah portion of *Naso*. The Torah states: **"And the nazirite shall shave his consecrated head at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting, and shall take the hair of his consecrated head and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace-offering"** (Numbers 6:18). **Rabbi Yoshiya says: The verse is speaking of the peace-offering. Or perhaps it is only teaching that he shaves at the actual entrance to the Tent of Meeting? If so, the Torah said: "And you shall not ascend by steps to My altar"** (Exodus 20:23). By an *a fortiori* inference with regard to this matter it is derived that he should not shave at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting. Rather, the verse is speaking of the peace-offering.

NOTES

Rabbi Yoshiya says it is not necessary – רבי יאשיה אומר אינו צריך – That is, it is not necessary to derive from here that one may not treat the Temple in a degrading manner (Commentary on *Nazir*). Some state that the first *tanna* maintains that this *halakha* is derived solely by logical reasoning, to which Rabbi Yoshiya replies that this is not necessary, as one can learn this by an *a fortiori* inference from an explicit source (Rosh).

Other commentaries maintain that these explanations are forced (*Tosafot*). They prefer the alternative version, which appears in brackets in the text, of halakhic midrash in the *Sifrei*, according to which the first *tanna* himself is Rabbi Yoshiya, who does not say: It is not necessary. Instead, he cites the verse as proof that the Torah prohibited acting in a degrading manner toward the Temple (Rabbeinu Peretz).

HALAKHA

The place where he would cook – **מִקוֹם שֶׁהָיָה מְבַשֵּׁל** – Nazirites would generally shave their hair and cook their peace-offerings in a chamber in the southeast corner of the women’s courtyard. This chamber is known as the nazirite’s chamber (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:3).

As the entrance to the Tent of Meeting is not open – **שִׂאִין פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד פְּתוּחַ**: A nazirite may shave only when the entrance to the Tent of Meeting is open. However, he does not shave at the entrance itself, as this is degrading to the Temple, as stated by Abba Hanan (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:3).

NOTES

And not a female nazirite – **וְלֹא נְזִירָה**: Some commentaries maintain that Rabbi Shimon Shezuri’s statement is unrelated to those of the previous Sages. Others claim that Rabbi Shimon Shezuri disagrees with the earlier opinions, as he rules that a nazirite must shave at the actual entrance to the Tent of Meeting. He therefore states that a female nazirite does not do so, as it would be immodest for her to shave in a public place.

רבי יצחק אומר: אינו צריך, הרי הוא אומר “ולקח את שער ראש נורו ונתן על האש” וגו’ – מי שאינו מחוסר אלא לקיחה ונתניה, יצא זה שהוא מחוסר לקיחה הבאה ונתניה.

Rabbi Yitzhak says: It is not necessary to cite an indirect proof that a nazirite may not shave at the entrance to the Sanctuary, as the verse states with regard to a nazirite: “**And he shall take the hair of his consecrated head and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace-offering**” (Numbers 6:18). The verse is referring to one who has not yet performed only the stages of taking and placing his shaven hair under the pot of the peace-offering, which is outside the Sanctuary. These two stages are the only ones he lacks; he does not have to do any other action. That excludes this one, a nazirite who shaved at the entrance to the Sanctuary, as he has not yet performed three actions, taking, bringing the hair from one sanctified area to another, and placing his shaven hair under the pot of the peace-offering.

איכא דאמרי: רבי יצחק אומר: בשלמים הכתוב מדבר. אתה אומר בשלמים הכתוב מדבר, או אינו אלא פתח אהל מועד ממש? תלמוד לומר “ולקח את שער ראש נורו” – מקום שהיה מבשל שם היה מגלח.

Some say a different version of this statement. Rabbi Yitzhak says: The verse is referring to the peace-offering. He clarifies his assertion: Do you say the verse is speaking of the peace-offering, or is it teaching only that he shaves at the actual entrance to the Tent of Meeting? The verse states: “**And he shall take the hair of his consecrated head and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace-offering**” (Numbers 6:18). This indicates that in the same place where he would cook^h the peace-offering, outside the courtyard, there he would shave.

אבא חנן אומר משום רבי אליעזר: “וגלח הנזיר... פתח אהל מועד” – כל זמן שאין פתח אהל מועד פתוח אינו מגלח.

Abba Hanan says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer that the verse “**And the nazirite shall shave his consecrated head at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting**” (Numbers 6:18) is referring to the time rather than the place of his shaving, i.e., this verse teaches that as long as the entrance to the Tent of Meeting is not open,^h he may not shave. He may shave only during those hours when the entrance to the Sanctuary is open.

רבי שמעון שזורי אומר: “וגלח הנזיר... פתח אהל מועד” – ולא נזירה

Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: The phrase “**And the nazirite shall shave his consecrated head at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting**” does not refer to the place of his shaving. Rather, the masculine form of the word nazirite serves to emphasize that this applies to a male nazirite and not a female nazirite.ⁿ A woman does not shave her head in the Sanctuary,

Perek VI
Daf 45 Amud b

LANGUAGE

Young priests [*pirhei khehuna*] – פְּרִיחֵי כְּהוּנָה: *Kehuna* means pertaining to the priesthood. *Pirhei* means something young and small in the process of maturation and blooming, similar to *perah*, a flower. The Hebrew word *efroah* and the Aramaic *pirhata*, meaning chick, are likewise derived from the same root. Accordingly, *pirhei khehuna* means young priests.

שָׂמָא יתגרו בה פרחי כהונה. אמר לו: לדברך, סוטה תוכיח, דכתיב בה “והעמידה לפני ה’”, ולא חיישינן שָׂמָא יתגרו בה פרחי כהונה!

lest the young priests [*pirhei khehuna*]^l present will become aroused by her when she uncovers her hair in their presence. One of the other Sages said to Rabbi Shimon Shezuri: According to your statement, the case of a *sota*^b will prove that this is not a concern, as it is written with regard to her: “**And he shall set her before the Lord**” (Numbers 5:16), and yet we are not concerned that perhaps the young priests will become aroused by her when her hair is uncovered.

BACKGROUND

Sota – סוטה: The Torah describes the procedure governing the *sota*, a woman who is suspected of adultery by her husband (Numbers 5:11–31). First, her husband warns her in the presence of witnesses to not seclude herself with a particular man about whom he is suspicious. If she disobeys this warning and is observed alone with that man, she and her husband can no longer live together as a married couple until she has undergone the following ritual to prove her innocence.

The woman, accompanied by her husband and two Torah scholars, is taken to the Temple in Jerusalem and forced by the priests to stand in a public place while holding the special meal-offering that she is required to bring. There, she is again questioned about her behavior. If she continues to protest her

fidelity and takes an oath to that effect, a scroll is brought and the curses mentioned in the Torah with regard to the *sota* are written on it. If she does not admit that she has committed adultery, the scroll is submerged in a clay vessel filled with water taken from the Temple basin and some earth from the Temple floor, and the scroll’s writing is dissolved in the water. She is then forced to drink that water.

If the husband’s allegation is true, then in the words of the Torah: “Her belly shall swell and her thigh shall fall away” (Numbers 5:27), until ultimately she dies from the water’s curse. If she is innocent, the water will bring her the blessing of children and she is permitted to resume normal marital relations with her husband.

Paints her eyes blue [*kohelet*] – כּוּחֶלֶת: The eye shadow described here is kohl, apparently a black-blue color that was derived from the mineral stibnite, Sb_2S_3 . This was a cosmetic prepared from ground stibnite crystals used by women to accentuate the eyes and make them appear larger.



Stibnite



Ancient kohl tube



Ancient kohl applicator

אָמַר לָהֶן זֹ בּוּחֶלֶת וּפּוֹקֶסֶת, זֹ אֵינָהּ בּוּחֶלֶת וּפּוֹקֶסֶת.

Rabbi Shimon Shezuri said to them: There is a difference between a female nazirite and a *sota*. This one, the nazirite, paints her eyes blue [*kohelet*]⁸ and applies blush [*fokeset*]¹ to her face, and therefore there is a concern that young priests might be aroused by her appearance. By contrast, that one, the *sota*, does not apply blue eye shadow and does not apply blush. Since a *sota* is not beautified, but is made to appear wretched and looks disheveled, there is no concern that she might arouse the men.

מִתְנִי' הִיָּה נוּטֵל שְׂעַר רֹאשׁ נָזִיר וּמְשַׁלַּח תַּחַת הַדּוֹד, וְאִם גִּילַח בְּמִדְיָנָה – לֹא הִיָּה מְשַׁלַּח תַּחַת הַדּוֹד. בְּמִה דְּבָרִים אֲמֹרִים – בְּתִגְלַחַת הַטְּהָרָה, אֲבָל בְּתִגְלַחַת הַטּוּמְאָה לֹא הִיָּה מְשַׁלַּח תַּחַת הַדּוֹד.

MISHNA After the nazirite shaved off his hair, he would take the hair of his consecrated head and throw it under the pot in which the peace-offering was cooked, where it would burn. And if the nazirite shaved in the rest of the country,⁸ i.e., outside the Temple, he would not throw⁹ the hair under the pot. In what case is this statement said? It is said with regard to the shaving of purity. However, with regard to the shaving of impurity, i.e., shaving that accompanied his guilt-offering and sin-offering of birds after his term of naziriteship was interrupted by impurity, he would not throw his hair under the pot in which his offerings were cooked, as the Torah stated this requirement only for a pure nazirite.

רַבִּי מֵאִיר אֹמֵר: הַכֵּל מְשַׁלְּחִין תַּחַת הַדּוֹד, חוּץ מִן הַטּוּמְאָה שְׁבַמְדִינָה בְּלִבָּד.

Rabbi Meir says: Everyone throws his hair under the pot, including a pure nazirite who shaved outside the Temple and an impure nazirite, except for an impure nazirite who shaved in the rest of the country. In that case alone he refrains from throwing his hair to be burned beneath his offering.

גַּמ' נוּטֵל שְׂעַר רֹאשׁ נָזִיר. תִּנּוּ רַבָּנִין: וְאַחַר כֵּךְ נוּטֵל אֶת הַרוֹטֵב, וְנוֹתֵן עַל שְׂעַר רֹאשׁ נָזִיר, וּמְשַׁלַּח תַּחַת הַדּוֹד שֶׁל שְׁלָמִים. וְאִם שִׁילַח תַּחַת הַדּוֹד שֶׁל חַטָּאת וְאָשָׁם – יֵצֵא. אָשָׁם בְּנוֹר [טָהוֹר] מִי אֵיבָא? אָמַר רַבָּא: הֵכִי קָאָמַר: וְאִם נוֹר טָמֵא מְשַׁלַּח תַּחַת הַדּוֹד שֶׁל אָשָׁם – יֵצֵא.

GEMARA The mishna states that he would take the hair of his consecrated head. The Sages taught: And afterward, after cooking the peace-offering, he takes the gravy [*rotev*]¹⁰ in which the offering had been cooked, places it on the shaven hair of his consecrated head, and throws the hair under the pot of his peace-offering. And if he threw his hair under the pot of the sin-offering or the guilt-offering,¹¹ he has fulfilled his obligation after the fact. The Gemara expresses surprise at this statement: Is there a guilt-offering brought by a pure nazirite? Only an impure nazirite brings a guilt-offering. Rava said that this is what the *tanna* said, i.e., meant: And if an impure nazirite threw his hair under the pot of the guilt-offering, he has fulfilled his obligation.

LANGUAGE

Applies blush [*pokeset*] – פּוֹקֶסֶת: From the Greek $\phi\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, *fukos*, meaning red paint or cream, or in this case blush, a red cosmetic. Some claim the Greek term is derived from the Hebrew *pokh*.

Gravy [*rotev*] – רוֹטֵב: *Rotev* refers to the fat or other juices that drip from cooked meat, principally from a roast. Some commentaries explain that the equivalent term *marak* in the Bible does not refer to the sauce that one adds to meat for cooking, but to the liquid that exudes from the meat itself when cooked.

NOTES

And if he shaved in the rest of the country – וְאִם גִּילַח בְּמִדְיָנָה: As previously stated, a nazirite need not shave at the entrance to the Temple. Although it was customary for nazirites to shave and cook their peace-offerings in the nazirites' chamber in the women's courtyard, this is not obligatory. Opinions differ with regard to the meaning of the term: Rest of the country. Some maintain that it refers to anywhere in Eretz Yisrael outside the Temple, including other parts of Jerusalem (*Tosafot*). Others contend that it means only the parts of Jerusalem outside the Temple, as the nazirites were obligated to cook and eat their peace-offerings in the city (Meiri; Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura).

In the rest of the country he would not throw – בְּמִדְיָנָה לֹא: The reason for this *halakha* is that if he were to shave outside of Jerusalem he would have to bring his hair to the Temple, and as stated previously (45a) he must perform only two actions, taking and placing, not bringing. Some commentaries explain that this is derived from a straightforward reading of the verses, which indicate that the nazirite must shave and burn his hair in the same place where the peace-offering is cooked. An alternative version reads: Would throw (Rambam; see Jerusalem Talmud). The commentaries explain that according to this version the fact that he does not bring his hair to the Temple is not a problem, as this is not an essential part of the ritual (Meiri).

HALAKHA

He takes the gravy – נוּטֵל אֶת הַרוֹטֵב: The nazirite cooks or overcooks his peace-offering. After taking gravy from the meat and placing it on the shaven hair, he throws the hair under the pot of the peace-offering (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:2).

Under the pot of the sin-offering or guilt-offering – תַּחַת הַדּוֹד: שֶׁל חַטָּאת וְאָשָׁם: If an impure nazirite threw his hair under the pot of his guilt-offering, or if a pure nazirite threw it under the pot of his sin-offering, he has fulfilled his obligation, as stated in the *baraita*, in accordance with the statement of Rava (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:14; 8:2).

מזבחו יהא – Part of his sacrifice must be under the hair – תחתיו: The derivation is based on the apparently superfluous term “sacrifice,” which indicates that a portion of the offering must be under the rest of it, i.e., in the fire beneath the pot (Rosh).

Overcook it [sholkan] – שולקן: There are different opinions with regard to the meaning of this term. Some explain that *shelika* means cooking very lightly (Commentary on *Nazir*; Rabbeinu Todros), whereas others maintain the reverse, that it refers to something cooked more than the usual amount (*Tosafot*; Rosh; Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*). In any case, everyone agrees that although *shelika* differs from regular cooking, it is still classified as cooking. Consequently, any discussion concerning cooking invariably refers to *shelika* as well.

ואחר כך הותר – And afterward the nazirite is permitted – הנזיר: Some commentaries maintain that this ruling, that the nazirite must finish the entire ritual before he may drink wine, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar (*Tosafot*; see 46a). The *Hazon Ish* infers from the Rambam that although the nazirite retains his nazirite status until he has completed the ritual, he is permitted in practice to drink wine and become impure from a corpse after the sprinkling of the blood of one of the offerings, as the mishna proceeds to explain.

מנא הני מילי? אמר רבא: אמר קרא “אשר תחת זבח השלמים” – מוזבחו יהא תחתיו.

ואם שילח תחת הדוד של חטאת וצא, מאי טעמא? אמר קרא “זבח” – לרבות את החטאת ואשם. והא אפיקתיה להאי “זבח” מרובא? אם בן לימא קרא “מרובא השלמים”, מאי “זבח” – שמע מינה לרבות חטאת ואשם.

ואימא בולה לחטאת ואשם היו דאתא! אם בן לימא “שלמים וזבח”, מאי “זבח השלמים” – שמע מינה תרתי.

תנו רבנן: הכל היו משלחין תחת הדוד, חוץ מטמא שגילה במדינה, מפני ששערו נקבר, דברי רבי מאיר. רבי יהודה אומר: טהורים – כאן וכאן היו משלחין, טמאים – כאן וכאן לא היו משלחין. וחכמים אומרים: הכל לא היו משלחין תחת הדוד, חוץ מן טהור שבמקדש, מפני שנעשה כמצותו.

מתני' היה מבשיל את השלמים או שולקן. הכהן נוטל את הזרוע בשלה מן האיל, וחלה מצה אחת מן השל, ורקיק מצה אחת, ונותן על כפי הנזיר ומנפן, ואחר כך הותר הנזיר לשותות יין ולהטמא למתים.

The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived, that he must pour gravy from the offering over his hair? Rava said that as the verse states: “And he shall take the hair of his consecrated head and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace-offering” (Numbers 6:18), this indicates that part of his sacrifice must be under the hair.^N

With regard to the statement of the *baraita*: And if he threw his hair under the pot of the sin-offering he has fulfilled his obligation, the Gemara asks: What is the reason for this? The Gemara answers that the verse states: “The sacrifice of the peace-offering,” when it could simply have stated: The peace-offering. This serves to include the sin-offering and the guilt-offering, which are also sacrifices. The Gemara asks: But you have already derived from this term “sacrifice” that he must pour part of the gravy of the peace-offering over his hair. The Gemara answers: If so, let the verse say explicitly: From the gravy of the peace-offering. Why does it state: “Sacrifice”? Learn from here that it serves to include the sin-offering and the guilt-offering.

The Gemara questions this statement from a different perspective: And one can say that this verse comes entirely to teach about the sin-offering and guilt-offering, and it does not refer to the gravy at all. The Gemara answers: If so, let it state: Peace-offering and a sacrifice; for what reason does it write: “The sacrifice of the peace-offering”? Conclude two conclusions from the verse.

§ The Sages taught (*Tosefta* 4:6): All nazirites would throw their hair under the pot, except for an impure nazirite who shaved in the rest of the country, because that one's hair is buried.^H This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: Pure nazirites, whether they are here or there, inside or outside the Temple, would throw^H their hair under the pot; impure nazirites, whether here or there,^H would not throw it. And the Rabbis say: None would throw their hair under the pot, except for a pure nazirite in the Temple, because only in that case is the mitzva performed properly, as commanded by the Torah.

MISHNA The nazirite would cook the peace-offering^H or overcook it,^N i.e., cook it thoroughly. The priest takes the cooked foreleg^H from the ram, and one unleavened loaf from the basket, and one unleavened wafer, and places them on the palms of the nazirite and waves them, as described in the Torah (Numbers 6:19–20). And afterward the nazirite is permitted^N to drink wine and to contract ritual impurity imparted by a corpse.

HALAKHA

Because his hair is buried – מפני ששערו נקבר: No benefit may be derived from the hair of an impure nazirite, whether he shaved inside or outside the Temple. Instead, the hair must be buried. If it is burned, its ashes are forbidden, like the ashes of all forbidden items that require burial (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 19:11, 13–14).

Here or there they would throw – כאן וכאן היו משלחין: A pure nazirite throws his hair under the pot, whether he shaved inside or outside the Temple, as maintained by both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Meir, in accordance with the Rambam's version of the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:3 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

Impure nazirites here or there – טמאים כאן וכאן: An impure nazirite need not throw his hair under the fire after he shaves,

in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:14).

Cook the peace-offering, etc. – מבשיל את השלמים וכו': A nazirite may cook or overcook his peace-offering, as he chooses (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:2).

Takes the cooked foreleg, etc. – נוטל את הזרוע בשלה וכו': The priest takes the cooked foreleg from the ram of the peace-offering, one unleavened loaf, and one unleavened wafer from the basket and places them on the palms of the male or female nazirite, together with the breast, thigh, and sacrificial parts of the offering. He then places his hands under those of the nazirite and waves the items. After this has been performed, the nazirite is permitted to drink wine and to contract impurity imparted by a corpse (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:4 and *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 9:9).