

רבי שמעון אומר: בין שניקח עליו אחד מן הדמים – הותר הנזיר לשתות בין ולהיטיבא למיתים.

גמ' תנו רבנן: "ואחר ישתה הנזיר יין" אחר המעשים כולו, דברי רבי אליעזר. ורבנן אומרם: אחר מעשה יחידי.

מאי טעמייהו דרבנן? כתיב הכא "ואחר ישתה הנזיר יין" וכתיב התם "אחר התגלחו את נורו", מה התם אחר מעשה יחידי, אף כאן – אחר מעשה יחידי.

אימא עד דאיכא תרווייהו אי הכי, גזירה שוה למה לי?

אמר רב: תנופה בנזיר מעבבת. אליבא דמאן? אילימא אליבא דרבנן – תגלחת אמרי רבנן לא מעבבת, תנופה מיבעיא?

אלא אליבא דרבי אליעזר – פשיטא, האמר רבי אליעזר: אחר מעשים כולם! מהו דתימא: בין דלעגן כפרה שגרי מצוה היא, הכא נמי לא תעבב, קא משמע לן.

Rabbi Shimon says: Once the blood of one of the offerings has been sprinkled on the nazirite's behalf,^h the nazirite is permitted to drink wine and to contract ritual impurity imparted by a corpse. The rest of the ritual is not indispensable for his purification.

GEMARA The Sages taught: It states at the end of the passage dealing with naziriteship: “**And after that the nazirite may drink wine**” (Numbers 6:20), which means **after all the actions**, i.e., after he has sacrificed all the offerings and shaved, thereby completing the entire ritual of a nazirite. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. **And the Rabbis say: After a single action.** He may drink wine after sacrificing one offering, even if he has yet to shave, as shaving is not indispensable for being permitted to drink wine.

The Gemara clarifies: **What is the reason of the Rabbis? It is written here: “And after that the nazirite may drink wine,” and it is written there**, in the previous verse: “**And the priest shall take the cooked foreleg...and place it on the palms of the nazirite after he has shaven his naziriteship**” (Numbers 6:19). It is derived by verbal analogy: **Just as there** the term “after” means **after a single action**, i.e., shaving, **here too**, the term “after” means **after a single action**, sacrificing one offering.

The Gemara asks: Perhaps one can say that a nazirite is not permitted to drink wine **until there are both** actions, i.e., sacrificing an offering and shaving, as implied by a straightforward reading of the verse. The Gemara answers: **If so, why do I need this verbal analogy?** It must be teaching that a nazirite can drink wine after the performance of a single action.

S Rav said: The priest's lack of **waving** of the offering of a nazirite **precludes** the release of the prohibitions of his naziriteship. The Gemara asks: **According to whose opinion** did Rav state this *halakha*? **If we say that he spoke in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis**, this is difficult, as **the Rabbis say** that even lack of **shaving does not preclude** the completion of his naziriteship. Is it **necessary**, then, to state that **waving**,^h which is not indispensable in the case of other offerings, is not essential for the ritual of a nazirite?

Rather, will you say that it is **in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer**, who permits a nazirite to drink wine only after he has completed the entire ritual? This is **obvious**; **didn't Rabbi Eliezer say** that he is permitted to drink wine only **after all the actions** are completed? The Gemara answers that the statement is necessary, **lest you say: Since with regard to the atonement effected by all other offerings, waving is considered a peripheral aspect of the mitzva**, i.e., one achieves atonement even if he did not perform the ritual of waving, **here too** its lack **does not preclude** the release of a nazirite's prohibitions. Rav therefore **teaches us** that according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer waving is essential in the case of a nazirite.

HALAKHA

Once the blood of one of the offerings has been sprinkled on his behalf – בין שניקח עליו אחד מן הדמים – As soon as the blood of one of a nazirite's offerings has been sprinkled on his behalf, he is permitted to drink wine and to contract ritual impurity imparted by a corpse. His shaving is not an indispensable feature of his ritual, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon and the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:5).

Is it necessary to state that waving – תנופה מיבעיא – Even if the priest did not place the items on the nazirite's palms and did not wave them, this requirement is peripheral to the mitzva, i.e., it is not essential to the ritual. Consequently, he is no longer bound by the prohibitions of naziriteship as soon as the blood of one of his offerings has been sprinkled (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:5).

HALAKHA

Whether he has palms, etc. – בין שיש לו כפפים וכו' – If a nazirite lacks palms, or if he was entirely bald, nevertheless he may sacrifice his offerings, despite the fact that he cannot wave or shave, respectively (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:5).

An entirely bald nazirite – נזיר ממוקט – An entirely bald nazirite does not have to pass a razor over his head. The *halakha* follows Beit Hillel, in accordance with the *Tosefta* and the Gemara in tractate *Yoma* (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:5).

Does not have a thumb, etc. – אין לו בהן ידוכי – A leper who is missing his right thumb, the big toe of his right foot, or his right ear can never be ritually purified, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Mehuserei Kappara* 5:1).

NOTES

He has no remedy – אין לו תקנה – In other words, Rabbi Eliezer, who holds that shaving is essential to the ritual, maintains that this nazirite cannot perform the purification rite at all. According to the Rabbis, Beit Shammai mean that he has no way of remedying this particular mitzva of shaving (*Tosafot*).

ומי מעבבא? והתניא: "זאת תורת הנזיר" – בין שיש לו כפפים בין שאין לו כפפים.

ואלא הא דתניא: "זאת תורת הנזיר" – בין שיש לו שער בין שאין לו שער, הכי נמי דלא מעבבא? והתניא: נזיר ממוקט, בית שמאי אומרים: אינו צריך להעביר תער על ראשו, ובית הלל אומרים: צריך להעביר תער על ראשו.

ואמר רבינא: מאי "אינו צריך" לבית שמאי – אינו צריך אין לו תקנה, הא לבית הלל – יש לו תקנה.

והיינו דרבי פדת. דאמר רבי פדת: בית שמאי ורבי אליעזר אמרו דבר אחד.

מאי רבי אליעזר? דתניא: אין לו בהן יד ורגל – אין לו טהרה עולמית, דברי רבי אליעזר. רבי שמעון אומר: ניחגנו על מקומו ויצא, וחכמים אומרים: יניח על של שמאל ויצא.

לישנא אחרינא אמרי לה, אמר רב: תנופה בנזיר מעבבת. אליבא דמאן? אליבא דרבי אליעזר – פשיטא, האמר רבי אליעזר: אחר מעשים כולם! אלא אליבא דרבנן – השתא יש לומר תגלחת אמרי רבנן לא מעבבא, תנופה מיבעיא?

The Gemara raises a difficulty against Rabbi Eliezer's opinion: **And does a lack of waving preclude** the performance of the purification ritual of a nazirite? **But isn't it taught** in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 1:5): The inclusive phrase: "**This is the law of the nazirite,**" (Numbers 6:21) teaches that all nazirites are bound by the same *halakha*, **whether he has palms,**^h **or whether he does not have palms.** Since one who is lacking palms certainly cannot wave, this indicates that waving is not essential.

The Gemara refutes this proof: **But what about that which is taught** in a similar *baraita* (*Tosefta* 1:5): "**This is the law of the nazirite**" **whether he has hair or whether he does not have hair; so too,** will you explain that lack of shaving does **not preclude** the ritual in the case of one who has no hair? **But isn't it taught** in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 1:6): With regard to an entirely bald nazirite,^h who cannot shave his hair with a razor as required, **Beit Shammai say: He need not pass a razor over his head, and Beit Hillel say: He must pass a razor over his head.**

And Ravina said: What is the meaning of the term: Need not, stated by Beit Shammai? It means that **he need not** shave, and **he has no remedy,**ⁿ and he has no way to complete his naziriteship. This indicates that **according to Beit Hillel he does have a remedy,** i.e., he can pass a razor over his head and thereby fulfill the mitzva, despite the fact that he does not have any hair. Similarly, one can say that Rabbi Eliezer holds that waving is indispensable, and when the *baraita* states: Whether he has palms or whether he does not have palms, could mean that waving is indispensable.

The Gemara adds: **And this** interpretation, that Beit Shammai and Rabbi Eliezer maintain one who is unable to perform the action mandated by the Torah has no remedy and cannot complete his naziriteship, **is in accordance with a statement of Rabbi Pedat. As Rabbi Pedat said: Beit Shammai and Rabbi Eliezer said the same thing,** i.e., they follow the same principle.

To what statement of **Rabbi Eliezer** is Rabbi Pedat referring? **As it is taught** in a *baraita*: A leper who **does not have a thumb^h or big toe,** upon both of which he must place the blood and oil of his purification ritual (Leviticus 14:14) can **never** attain ritual purity. This is the **statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Shimon says: The priest puts it on the spot** of the missing thumb, and the leper thereby **fulfills** his obligation. **The Rabbis say: Let him put it on the left thumb and thereby fulfill** his obligation. According to Rabbi Pedat, Rabbi Eliezer and Beit Shammai both maintain that if the ritual cannot be performed in the precise manner delineated, one cannot fulfill his obligation and has no remedy. This is one version of the discussion.

The Gemara cites **another version** of this discussion. **Some say that Rav said:** The priest's lack of **waving** of the offering of a **nazirite precludes** the release of the prohibitions of his naziriteship. The Gemara asks: **According to whose** opinion did he state this *halakha*? **If we say that he spoke in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, this is obvious; didn't Rabbi Eliezer say that he is permitted to drink wine only after all his actions,** including waving? **Rather,** you will say that Rav spoke **in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis.** However, this too is puzzling: **Now that one can say that with regard to shaving,** a central part of the naziriteship ritual, **the Rabbis say that its omission does not preclude** the fulfillment of his ritual, **is it necessary to state that waving is not essential?**

Beit Hillel means that he must and he has no remedy – **בית הלל צריך ואין לו תקנה**: According to this interpretation, the Rabbis agree with Beit Hillel that waving is similar to the indispensable task of shaving. Consequently, one who lacks palms has no way of resolving this issue and completing his naziriteship.

וזבחי לא עליו וכו' – Many commentaries explain that even the offerings he sacrifices later do not count toward his obligation, as he is required to observe another term of naziriteship, having shaved before sacrificing any of his offerings. It is as though he has brought the offerings during the middle of his naziriteship term (*Tosafot*). Others maintain that this refers only to the offerings he sacrificed before he became aware of the invalidation (*Shita Mekubbetzet*).

HALAKHA

If he shaved based upon the offering and it was found invalid – גילח על הזבח ונמצא פסול – If a nazirite shaved based upon a peace-offering that was later discovered to be invalid, his shaving is invalid. It is considered as though he shaved during his term of naziriteship, and he must therefore add thirty days to it. Likewise, his offerings do not count toward fulfilling his obligation. He must bring his naziriteship offerings again, after observing the additional thirty days (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:8, 11).

If he shaved based upon the sin-offering that was sacrificed not for its own sake – גילח על החטאת שלא לשמה – If a nazirite shaved based upon a sin-offering that was later found to have been sacrificed not for its own sake, then even if he subsequently sacrificed the burnt-offering and peace-offering in the proper manner his shaving is invalid and his offerings do not count toward fulfilling his obligation (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:8, 11).

If he shaved based upon the burnt-offering, etc. – גילח – If a nazirite shaved based upon his burnt-offering or peace-offering and later they were discovered to have been sacrificed not for their own sake, then even if he sacrificed the other offerings in the proper manner his shaving is invalid and his offerings do not count toward fulfilling his obligation (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:9).

If he shaved based upon all three of them – גילח על – If a nazirite shaved based upon his three offerings, his shaving is valid even if only one of them was sacrificed for its own sake. However, he must bring his other offerings and sacrifice them in the proper manner (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:10).

ומי לא מעבבא? והתנא: "זאת תורת הנזיר, בין שיש לו כפיים ובין שאין לו כפיים! ואלא הא דתנא: "זאת תורת הנזיר" – בין שיש לו שער ובין שאין לו שער, הכי נמי דמעבבא?

The Gemara asks: **And doesn't the lack of waving preclude a nazirite's ritual? But isn't it taught in a baraita (Tosefta 1:5):** The inclusive phrase: **"This is the law of the nazirite,"** teaches that **whether he has palms or whether he does not have palms waving is always required, and a nazirite is not exempted by a lack of palms.** The Gemara questions this interpretation of the *baraita*. **But what about that which is taught in the same baraita (Tosefta 1:5): "This is the law of the nazirite," whether he has hair or whether he does not have hair; so too, will you say that the lack of shaving precludes his ritual?**

והתנא: נזיר ממורט, בית שמאי ואומר: אינו צריך להעביר תער על ראשו, ובית הלל אומר: צריך! אמר רבי אבינא: מאי צריך לבית הלל – צריך ואין לו תקנה.

But isn't it taught in a baraita (Tosefta 1:6): With regard to an entirely bald nazirite, **Beit Shammai say: He need not pass a razor over his head, and Beit Hillel say: He must pass a razor over his head.** This *baraita* indicates that even according to the opinion of Beit Hillel a nazirite does not have to actually shave. **Rabbi Avina said: What is the meaning of: He must, as stated by Beit Hillel?** It means that **he must shave, and if he fails to do so he has no remedy,ⁿ and can never drink wine.**

לבית שמאי – יש לו תקנה, ופליגא דרבי פדת.

Conversely, **according to the opinion of Beit Shammai he has a remedy, as he does not have to use a razor at all. And this interpretation disagrees with the opinion of Rabbi Pedat.** Rabbi Pedat claims that both Beit Shammai and Rabbi Eliezer maintain that if the ritual cannot be performed in the precise manner delineated, one cannot fulfill his obligation and has no remedy. By contrast, Rabbi Avina contends that Beit Shammai exempt the nazirite from this obligation, while Beit Hillel say that he has no remedy.

מתני' גילח על הזבח ונמצא פסול – תגלחתו פסולה, וזבחי לא עלו לו. גילח על החטאת שלא לשמה, ואחר כך הביא קרבנותיו לשמן – תגלחתו פסולה, וזבחי לא עלו לו. גילח על העולה או על השלמים שלא לשמן, ואחר כך הביא קרבנותיו לשמן – תגלחתו פסולה, וזבחי לא עלו לו.

MISHNA As taught earlier (45a) the nazirite shaves after having brought one, or all, of his offerings. This mishna discusses what the *halakha* is if the offering was found to be invalid after the nazirite had shaved. **If a nazirite shaved based upon the requisite offering, and afterward the offering was found to be invalid^d for any reason, his shaving is invalid and his offerings do not countⁿ toward the fulfillment of his obligation.** If he shaved based upon the sin-offering, that was found to have been sacrificed not for its own sake,^h which invalidates the offering, and afterward he brought his other offerings for their own sake, his shaving is invalid and his other offerings do not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation. If he shaved based upon the requisite burnt-offering^h or having brought the requisite peace-offering, and these were offered not for their own sake, and afterward he brought his remaining offerings for their own sake, his shaving is invalid and his offerings do not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation.

רבי שמעון אומר: אותו הזבח לא עלה לו, אבל שאר זבחים עלו. ואם גילח על שלשתן ונמצא אחד מהן כשר – תגלחתו כשרה, ויביא שאר זבחים.

Rabbi Shimon says: In the case of one who shaved based upon a burnt-offering or a peace-offering that was sacrificed not for its own sake, **that offering, which was performed incorrectly, does not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation; however, his other offerings do count. And everyone agrees that if he shaved based upon all three of them,^h i.e., he brought all three offerings, without specifying which offering he is basing his shaving upon, and even one of them was found valid, his shaving is valid, but he must bring the other offerings in order to fulfill his obligation.**

גמ' אמר רב אדא בר אהבה: זאת אומרת: קסבר רבי שמעון: נזיר שגילח על שלמי נדבה – יצא. מאי טעמא – דאמר קרא "ונתן על האש אשר תחת זבח השלמים", ולא פתב "על שלמיו".

GEMARA Rav Adda bar Ahava said: **That is to say that Rabbi Shimon maintains that a nazirite who shaved based upon voluntary peace-offerings has fulfilled his obligation.** A peace-offering that was sacrificed not for its own sake does not count toward the fulfillment of one's obligation but is considered a voluntary gift-offering. It is clear from the mishna that Rabbi Shimon maintains that shaving based upon any valid offering, even a peace-offering of this type, is effective. **What is the reason for this? It is as the verse states: "And put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace-offering" (Numbers 6:18), and it is not written: On his peace-offering.** This indicates that he fulfills his obligation with any type of peace-offering.