

A sword is like one who is slain – **חָרֵב הָיָה זֶה כְּחַלָּל**: All the commentaries and authorities agree that a special *halakha* applies to a metal vessel rendered ritually impure by a corpse, as it imparts impurity like the corpse itself, so that one who touches it is impure for seven days. This is in contrast to any other vessel that was rendered impure by a corpse. Nevertheless, there are differences of opinion as to whether a sword is like a corpse in all regards, including the impurity imparted in a tent, or whether it imparts impurity only by contact, and some say by carrying as well. Likewise, some authorities maintain that just as it is accepted that the word sword includes all metal implements, the same *halakha* applies to all vessels that can be purified in a ritual bath, including wooden ones and the like.

A sealed grave – **קִבְרֵי סָתוּם**: Various *halakhot* apply to a sealed grave, although the details of these *halakhot* are subject to differences of opinion among the early commentaries. The basic *halakha* accepted by everyone is that a sealed grave that lacks the space of a handbreadth between the corpse and its cover imparts ritual impurity in a tent in the manner of a pressed ritual impurity. In other words, it renders impure anything positioned above the grave, even if a stone partition separates the corpse from that which overlies it.

“חָרֵב” – הָיָה זֶה כְּחַלָּל, “אוּ בְמֵת” – זֶה אֵבֶר הַנִּחְלָל מִן הַמֵּת, “אוּ בְעֵצִים אֲדָם” – זֶה רוֹבֵעַ עֲצָמוֹת “אוּ בְקִבְרֵי” – זֶה קִבְרֵי סָתוּם.

The Sages further derive from the phrase “one who is slain by the sword” that the legal status of a metal sword in terms of its degree of ritual impurity is like that of one who is slain,^{NH} i.e., a metal implement, e.g., a sword, that was rendered impure through contact with a corpse is impure to the same degree of severity as a corpse itself. “Or one who dies on his own”; this is a limb that was slain, i.e., severed, from a corpse^H and is covered with enough flesh that it would heal if he were alive. “Or a bone of a man”; this is a quarter-*kav* of bones.^H “Or a grave”; this is a sealed grave,^{NH} which imparts impurity when there is less than a handbreadth between the corpse and its cover.

HALAKHA

A sword is like one who is slain – **חָרֵב הָיָה זֶה כְּחַלָּל**: Some authorities maintain that any vessel rendered ritually impure by a corpse, whether by contact, carrying, or in a tent, imparts impurity via contact like a corpse itself, except for those items that cannot be purified in a ritual bath, e.g., earthenware vessels (Rambam). Others rule that even these implements impart impurity by carrying (Ramban). Yet others contend that this principle applies only to metal vessels, although they rule that these articles render people and items impure even in a tent (Ra’avad; *Tosafot*). Some authorities maintain that a priest is prohibited from contracting impurity from a sword that was rendered impure by a corpse, whereas others are lenient. The custom is not to be stringent in this regard (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 5:3; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’a* 369:1, and in the comment of Rema).

A limb that was slain from a corpse – **אֵבֶר הַנִּחְלָל מִן הַמֵּת**: A limb severed from a corpse imparts ritual impurity like a whole corpse, provided it contains flesh, sinews, and bones. If part of the bone is missing, but an olive-bulk of flesh remains, it

imparts impurity like a whole body. Some maintain that this bone imparts impurity only via contact and carrying (Ra’avad). If some of the flesh is lacking but enough remains that were this limb attached to a living person it would heal, it imparts impurity like an intact corpse. If it is not covered by sufficient flesh, it is like a regular bone from a corpse (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 2:4).

A quarter-*kav* of bones – **רוֹבֵעַ עֲצָמוֹת**: A quarter-*kav* of bones from a corpse imparts ritual impurity by contact, carrying, and in a tent, even if the bones comprise neither the majority of the number of bones in a body nor the majority of its structure, nor a whole spine nor a whole skull. If the bones amount to less than a quarter-*kav*, they do not impart impurity in a tent (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 2:9).

This is a sealed grave – **זֶה קִבְרֵי סָתוּם**: If a grave containing a corpse is sealed up, it imparts impurity by contact and in a tent. Consequently, a priest who touches the grave is liable to receive lashes (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 2:15 and *Sefer Shofetim, Hilkhhot Evel* 3:2).

Perek VII

Daf 54 Amud a

HALAKHA

Breaks through and ascends, etc. – **בּוֹקֵעַת וְעוֹלָה וְכוּ**: If a source of ritual impurity in a tent of a corpse was pressed ritual impurity, i.e., impurity separated from its cover by less than a handbreadth, the impurity breaks through to the sky and down to the depths, even if it is blocked by multiple barriers. However, it does not impart impurity to its surroundings (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 7:4–5; see Ra’avad).

A limb slain from the living – **אֵבֶר הַנִּחְלָל מִן הַחַי**: If a limb severed from a living person is not covered by enough flesh for it to heal were it attached, it imparts impurity by contact and carrying but not in a tent (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 2:3).

A grave before the command – **קִבְרֵי שְׁלֵפְנֵי הַדִּיבּוּר**: Gentiles and their graves do not render people and items impure in a tent (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 1:13).

דָּאָמַר מַר: טוּמְאָה בּוֹקֵעַת וְעוֹלָה בּוֹקֵעַת וְיורֶדֶת. וְאֵילוּ גַבֵּי נְגִיעָה, אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה, תִּנְיָא: “(וְכָל) הַנוֹגֵעַ בְּעֵצִים אוּ בְחַלָּל” – “בְּעֵצִים” – זֶה עֵצִים בְּשִׁעוּרָה, “אוּ בְחַלָּל” – זֶה אֵבֶר הַנִּחְלָל מִן הַחַי וְאֵין בּוֹ לְהַעֲלוֹת אֲרוּכָה,

As the Master said: Ritual impurity in a sealed grave breaks through and ascends^H and breaks through and descends, so that the grave imparts impurity like the corpse itself. While with regard to contact with these sources of impurity, Rav Yehuda said that it is taught in a *baraita* that the verse “and upon him that touched a bone, or the slain, or the dead, or the grave” (Numbers 19:18) is expounded as follows: “A bone”; this is a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk. “Or the slain”; this is a limb slain, i.e., severed, from the living,^H which does not contain enough flesh for it to heal.

“אוּ בְמֵת” – זֶה אֵבֶר הַנִּחְלָל מִן הַמֵּת, “אוּ בְקִבְרֵי” – אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: זֶה קִבְרֵי שְׁלֵפְנֵי הַדִּיבּוּר.

The *baraita* continues its interpretation of the verse. “Or the dead”; this is a limb slain from a corpse, which is not covered by enough flesh for it to heal were he alive. “Or the grave”; Reish Lakish said: This is a grave that contained a corpse from before the time the command^H of these *halakhot* was given to the Jewish people. These graves render people and items ritually impure by contact, but do not carry the *halakhot* of impurity imparted in a tent.

הַאי אֵבֶר מִן הַמֵּת הֵיכִי דְמִי? אֵי דְאִית בֵּיה עֵצִים בְּשִׁעוּרָה – הֵינּוּ הַנוֹגֵעַ בְּעֵצִים. אֶלָּא – דְלִית בֵּיה עֵצִים בְּשִׁעוּרָה, וְאֵפוֹלוּ הָיִי רְחֻמְנָא רַבִּינָה!

The Gemara asks: With regard to this limb from a corpse, which is listed above as imparting ritual impurity by contact, what are the circumstances of the case? If the limb contains a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk, this is included in the *halakha* of one who touches a bone, and it was already taught that a bone imparts impurity by contact. Rather, it must be that it does not contain a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk, and even so the Merciful One includes it in the *halakhot* of impurity, despite the fact that it does not contain enough flesh. This indicates that a nazirite shaves for a limb of this kind, in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish.

Actually that it does contain – לְעוֹלָם דְּאִית בֵּיהּ – If a limb severed from a dead body contains a bone the volume of a barley-grain-bulk, but it is not covered with enough flesh that it could heal were it on a living person, it imparts ritual impurity by carrying and contact but not in a tent (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Met* 2:4, see Ra'avad).

Have it refer to the matter of its carrying – תְּנַהוּ עֵנָן – לְמִשְׁאוֹ: A bone of a corpse the volume of a barley-grain-bulk imparts impurity by carrying as well as by contact (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Met* 3:2).

However, the hanging branches and the projecting stones, etc. – אֲבָל הַסִּכּוֹת וְהַפְּרָעוֹת וְכוּ' – If a nazirite became ritually impure due to a clod of earth from outside of Eretz Yisrael; or by walking through a *beit haperas*, a field in which a grave was plowed; or if branches of a tree or stones from a fence protruded and served as a tent over both him and a corpse, called hangings and projections by the mishna; or in a tent with a quarter-*kav* of bones that do not contain the majority of the structure or the majority of the number of bones of a corpse; or through a quarter-*log* of blood from a corpse; or by a grave cover or grave walls; or by a limb severed from a corpse or from a living person that was not covered by sufficient flesh; in all of these cases, the nazirite requires sprinkling on the third and seventh days but does not have to shave (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:6, 8).

אָמַר לָךְ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: לְעוֹלָם דְּאִית בֵּיהּ, וְאִם אֵינוֹ עֵנָן לְמַגְעוֹ – תְּנַהוּ עֵנָן לְמִשְׁאוֹ.

The Gemara responds: In answer to this proof of Reish Lakish, Rabbi Yohanan could have said to you: **Actually, you should explain that it does contain^h a bone the volume of a barley-grain-bulk, and if it does not need to refer to the matter of its contact,ⁿ as the verse explicitly states: "Anyone who touches a bone," have it refer to the matter of its carrying,^h i.e., that one who carries it is also rendered ritually impure.**

וּמִזֶּה בְּשִׁלְיֵי וּבְשִׁבְעֵי וְכוּ'.

§ The mishna taught with regard to any nazirite who became impure from one of the listed sources of impurity: **And a priest sprinkles the ashes of the red heifer on him on the third and on the seventh days, and he negates all the previous days he counted toward his naziriteship, and he does not begin counting a fresh term of naziriteship until after he becomes pure and brings his offerings.**

אֵיבְעֵינָא לְהוּ: הָא דְקִתְנִי "עַד שְׁיִטְהַר" – בְּשִׁבְעֵי קָאִי, עַד דְּעָבִיד הָעֵרֵב שְׁמֵשׁ, וּמִנֵּי – רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר הִיא. אִו דִּילְמָא: בְּשִׁבְעֵי קָאִי, וּמִאִי "עַד שְׁיִטְהַר" – עַד שְׁיִבְיָא קְרַבְנוֹתָיו, וּמִנֵּי – רַבְּנֵי הִיא?

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is the meaning of that which is taught that a nazirite does not start counting until he is purified? Does the mishna refer to one who is standing on the seventh day of his purification and mean: Until he performs the requisite waiting for sunset?ⁿ And whose opinion is it? It is the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who rules that a nazirite starts counting from the eighth day, even before he brings his offerings. Or perhaps it is referring to one who is standing on the eighth day. And then, what is the meaning of: Until he is purified? It means: Until he brings his offerings. And who is the author of this opinion? It is the Rabbis, who maintain that he begins his fresh period of naziriteship only after he has sacrificed his offering of impurity (see 18b).

תָּא שְׁמַע, מִדְּקִתְנִי סִיפָא "מִתְחִיל וּמוֹנָה מִיָּד". הָא רִישָׁא מֵאִי "עַד שְׁיִטְהַר" – עַד שְׁיִבְיָא קְרַבְנוֹתָיו, וּמִנֵּי – רַבְּנֵי הִיא, דְּאָמְרִי: נְזִירוֹת דְּטַהֲרָה עַד שְׁמִינֵי לָא תִּיִלָּא.

The Gemara answers: **Come and hear a resolution of this dilemma from the fact that it teaches in the latter clause of the next mishna that a nazirite who does not have to bring an offering starts counting immediately after the conclusion of his seven days of purification. The Gemara infers from this mishna: If so, what is the meaning of the different term used in the first clause: Until he is purified? It means until he brings his offerings, and whose opinion is it? It is that of the Rabbis, who say that the naziriteship of purity does not commence until the eighth day.**

מִתְנִי' אֲבָל הַסִּכּוֹת, וְהַפְּרָעוֹת, וּבֵית הַפָּרֶס.

MISHNA The previous mishna listed the sources of ritual impurity for which a nazirite must shave. This mishna adds: **However, the nazirite does not shave for these: The hanging branchesⁿ over a corpse, i.e., a tree overhanging a body that a nazirite passes, but it is uncertain which branches are over a corpse; and the projecting stones^h from fences when the place of the impurity is unknown; and a *beit haperas*, a place that contained a grave and was plowed. In the latter case, the entire area around the grave is impure from a corpse due to an uncertainty, as it might contain human bones.**

NOTES

אִם אֵינוֹ עֵנָן לְמַגְעוֹ – If it does not refer to the matter of its contact – The impurity imparted by touching a bone is derived from the words "and upon him that touched a bone" (Numbers 19:18). This includes a bone the volume of a barley-grain-bulk, even when it is not covered by flesh. Since the phrase "or the dead" is superfluous, the Sages learn from it that this bone imparts impurity by carrying as well. According to Rabbi Yohanan, this phrase is the main source for the *halakha* of the impurity imparted through carrying a bone the size of a barley-grain-bulk, which is not explicitly stated in the Torah. The commentaries note that Reish Lakish evidently derives this *halakha* from a different verse (Rabbeinu Azriel).

עַד דְּעָבִיד – Until he performs the requisite waiting for sunset – הָעֵרֵב שְׁמֵשׁ: Some early commentaries omit this phrase. The key issue is Rabbi Eliezer's opinion. According to some authorities, he maintains that the nazirite does not wait until evening but begins to count from the seventh day itself (*Tosafot*). Others contend that even according to Rabbi Eliezer, he starts counting only from the eighth day (Commentary on *Nazir*; see Rabbi Akiva Eiger on the mishna).

אֲבָל הַסִּכּוֹת וְכוּ' – However the hanging branches, etc. – This list of items that do not render a nazirite obligated to shave includes various rabbinic sources of ritual impurity, i.e., hanging branches, projecting stones, and the land of the nations. It is obvious that a nazirite need not shave for these sources of impurity, as the Sages would not impose a decree that nullifies a mitzva of the Torah. However, the mishna also lists other items, including a quarter-*log* of blood and a quarter-*kav* of bones, whose impurity applies by Torah law (see *Tosafot*). Some commentaries maintain that there is a difference between the *halakhot* of a nazirite and the *halakhot* pertaining to standard impurity from a corpse (Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna). With regard to a nazirite, the verse states: "And if any man dies very suddenly beside him" (Numbers 6:9), rather than: If he becomes impure from the body of a person. This indicates that a nazirite shaves only if he was rendered impure from an actual corpse. Others maintain that this verse teaches that the impurity for which a nazirite must shave is that of a whole corpse (Ra'avad). In any case, the Rambam himself states that those sources of impurity for which a nazirite need not shave do not impart impurity by Torah law.

BACKGROUND

Grave cover [*golel*] – גולל: A *golel* was a large stone that was rolled onto a grave or burial cave to seal its entrance. Burial caves of important people were covered with a large, wheel-shaped stone that could be rolled back to allow entrance to the cave.



Burial cave with stone cover in northern Israel

וְאֶרֶץ הָעַמִּים, וְהַגּוֹלֵל וְהַדּוֹפֵק, וְרִבְעֵית דָּם, וְאֶהָל, וְרוֹבַע עֲצָמוֹת, וְכֵלִים הַנוֹגְעִים בָּמֵת, וּבִימֵי סָפְרוֹ וּבִימֵי גָמְרוֹ – עַל אֵלוֹ אֵין הַנְּזִיר מְגַלֵּחַ.

The mishna continues its list: **And the land of the nations**, i.e., a nazirite left Eretz Yisrael for another land. The Sages decreed that all land outside of Eretz Yisrael is ritually impure. **And the grave cover;**^b **and the grave walls upon which the cover rests; and a quarter-log of blood** from a corpse; **and a tent; and a quarter-kav of bones**ⁿ of a corpse; **and vessels that are touching a corpse.** And if the nazirite is **in the days of his counting**, i.e., the seven days a leper must count after purification from his leprosy; **or in his days of full leprosy**, when he is a full-fledged leper, **for these the nazirite does not shave.**ⁿ This is the case even if he is rendered impure by one of the sources listed in the previous mishna.

וּמִזֶּה בְּשִׁלְשֵׁי וּבְשִׁבְעֵי,

And in those cases listed that involve ritual impurity from a corpse, one sprinkles the purification water upon him on the third and on the seventh days of his purification,

NOTES

וְאֶהָל וְרוֹבַע עֲצָמוֹת – **And a tent, and a quarter-kav of bones** – Some commentaries infer from the fact that the mishna lists a tent and a quarter-kav of bones as distinct items that a nazirite who comes into contact with a tent of a corpse need not shave (Rambam). Others maintain that this should be read as a single item: And the tent of a quarter-kav of bones (see Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura and *Tosefot Yom Tov*).

עַל אֵלוֹ אֵין הַנְּזִיר מְגַלֵּחַ – **For these the nazirite does not shave** – The commentaries note that this statement does not apply to all these cases, as a leper is in fact obligated to shave (*Tosafot*). Others state that although a leper must shave, this differs from the shaving of a nazirite, as a leper shaves all the hair of his body, not merely his head (Rabbeinu Peretz).

Perek VII
Daf 54 Amud b

HALAKHA

And he does not negate, etc. – וְאֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר וכו' – A nazirite who was rendered ritually impure by one of the sources of impurity listed in the mishna does not negate his earlier period of naziriteship. He neither shaves for his impurity nor brings the relevant offerings. After his purification, he continues to count the days of his naziriteship. However, the days of his impurity do not count toward his term (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:7–9).

Days of the zav, etc. – יְמֵי הַזָּב וכו' – The days of a leper's confinement and the days of the impurity of a *zav* or a *zava* count toward their naziriteship term, despite their impurity. This is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:9).

Hanging branches and projecting stones – סְכָכוֹת וּפְרָעוֹת – The hangings mentioned in the mishna are boughs that extend from trees, while projections are stones that jut out of fences. These are not strong enough to bear a medium-sized cover without bending inward. If they can bear that weight, they impart ritual impurity by Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:6 and *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Met* 13:2).

וְאֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר אֶת הַקּוֹדְמִים, וּמִתְחִיל וּמוֹנֵה מִיָּד, וְקִרְבָּן אֵין לוֹ. בְּאֵמַת אָמְרוּ: יְמֵי הַזָּב וְהַזָּבָה, וְיְמֵי הַסָּגֵר שֶׁל מְצוּרַע – הֲרִי אֵלוֹ עוֹלֵין לוֹ.

and he does not negate^h the earlier daysⁿ of his naziriteship, but they are considered part of his naziriteship term. **And he starts counting** the rest of his naziriteship to complete his term **immediately** after his purification, **and he has no obligation to sacrifice an offering of impurity for these sources of ritual impurity. Actually they said** an ancient tradition that these **days of the impurity of the zav** (Leviticus 15:1–15)^h **and the zava** (Leviticus 15:25–30) **and the days of the confinement of a leper** before he is confirmed as a full-fledged leper (Leviticus 13:4–5) **count for him** toward the period of his naziriteship.

גַּמ' וְאֵלוֹ הֵן הַסְּכָכוֹת – אֵילֵן הַמִּיֶּסֶךְ עַל הָאֶרֶץ, וּפְרָעוֹת – הַיּוֹצְאוֹת מִן הַגֶּדֶר.

GEMARA The Gemara explains the terms hangings and projections by citing a mishna (*Oholot* 8:2). **And these are the hangings: A tree that overhangs the earth.**ⁿ **And the projectionsⁿ are stones^h that protrude from a fence.**

NOTES

And he does not negate the earlier days – וְאֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר אֶת הַקּוֹדְמִים: Although he does not forfeit the earlier period, these days of purification do not count toward his naziriteship. Rather, after he is purified he resumes counting where he left off.

A tree that overhangs the earth – אֵילֵן הַמִּיֶּסֶךְ עַל הָאֶרֶץ: All commentaries agree that this is referring to a tree whose branches are spread apart so that they do not form one unbroken cover. The disagreements concern the details of the case. Some commentaries maintain that the branches in question are thinner than a handbreadth and are not positioned close together. As a result, they do not form a tent by Torah law, even if the nazirite were to walk under each of the branches (*Tosafot*). Others contend that this is referring to branches that are one handbreadth

wide, and the nazirite walked under some, but not all, of them. He is not rendered ritually impure by Torah law because the tree is situated in the public domain, and when there is uncertainty with regard to impurity in the public domain it is considered pure (Rabbeinu Peretz; see *Rosh*). Others indicate that the tree does not impart impurity by Torah law because the branches are not strong enough, and therefore it is classified as a shaky tent (Rambam).

Projections – פְּרָעוֹת: In this case, it was known that there was a grave of a stillborn or an olive-bulk from a corpse under one of the stones. However, the identity of that stone is unknown. Consequently, a nazirite who passes beneath some of the stones remains pure, as this is a case of uncertainty with regard to impurity in the public domain.

With regard to the air, why do I need this sprinkling – **משום** **אֵיבָעִיָּא לְהוּ אֶרְצָא הַעֲמִימִים מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא גְזֵרוּ עֲלֵיהּ לִי לְמָה לִּי**: The Sages initially decreed ritual impurity on the earth of the lands of the nations, which is imparted by contact and carrying. Later they extended the decree to its air, so that anyone who inserts his head and the majority of his body into those lands contracts impurity. However, the air imparts a lesser degree of impurity. It does not necessitate sprinkling on the third and seventh days; rather, one merely has to immerse and wait for sunset. Similarly, it is not necessary to burn *teruma* and offerings due to this impurity. For this reason, the Rambam rules that the *halakha* of the mishna is referring only to the impurity imparted by contact or carrying the earth of the land of the nations (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nezirut* 7:6 and *Lehem Mishne* there; and *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 11:1–2).

Do people who touch these vessels require sprinkling, etc. – **הֲנִי כְּלִים בְּנֵי הַזָּאֵה אֵינוֹן וְכוּ' –** If a nazirite touched vessels that came in contact with a corpse, he does not require sprinkling on the third and seventh days. This exception applies only to a nazirite, so that these days can count toward his term of naziriteship. Any other individual who becomes ritually impure from these vessels requires sprinkling on the third and seventh days (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nezirut* 7:8).

NOTES

These vessels require sprinkling – **הֲנִי כְּלִים בְּנֵי הַזָּאֵה –** Some commentaries cite this as proof that the vessels referred to by the mishna are made of materials other than metal, as metal vessels impart ritual impurity like the corpse itself (Rabbeinu Tam). Others claim that the vessels mentioned in the mishna are of all types, including metal ones (Rabbeinu Hayyim HaKohen). A nazirite does not have to shave for them because he shaves only for coming into contact with a corpse itself, not for all items classified as having the impurity of a corpse, as the verse states: "And if any man dies very suddenly beside him" (Numbers 6:9). Some claim that a nazirite does not even need to be sprinkled with water for those sources of impurity (Meiri).

וְאֶרְצָא הַעֲמִימִים. אֵיבָעִיָּא לְהוּ אֶרְצָא הַעֲמִימִים מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא גְזֵרוּ עֲלֵיהּ, אִוְרָא גְזֵרוּ עֲלֵיהּ מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא גְזֵרוּ עֲלֵיהּ?

The mishna further taught: **And the land of the nations** does not render a nazirite obligated to shave, despite the fact that it is considered ritually impure. The Gemara inquires with regard to the nature of this impurity. **A dilemma was raised before the Sages:** Did the Sages decree **the land of the nations impure with regard to the air**, i.e., is one rendered impure merely by being there? **Or perhaps they decreed it impure with regard to the earth**, i.e., one who touches the ground or overlays it becomes impure.

תָּא שָׁמַע: וּמִזְהָ בְּשִׁלְיָשִׁי וּבְשִׁבְעֵי. וְאִי אֶמְרַת מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא – הַזָּאֵה לְמָה לִּי?

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear** a resolution to this question from the mishna, which lists one who enters the land of the nations and states: **And one sprinkles on him on the third and on the seventh days. And if you say that the decree was with regard to the air, why do I need this sprinkling?**^H He neither touched something ritually impure nor overlaid it.

אֶלְא לְאִוְרָא מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא. לָא. לְעוֹלָם אֵימָא לָךְ מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא, וְכִי קֵתְנִי – אִשְׁאָרָא.

Rather, is it not with regard to the earth that the land of the nations was decreed impure? The Gemara rejects this proof: **No, actually I could say to you that the decree is due to the air, and when the mishna teaches that he receives the sprinkling, it is referring to the other items listed in the mishna**, e.g., the grave cover, the grave walls, and a quarter-log of blood.

הָכִי נִמְי מִסֵּתְבְּרָא, מְדַקְתָּנִי: וְכִלִּים הַנּוֹגְעִים בְּמַת; הֲנִי כְּלִים בְּנֵי הַזָּאֵה אֵינוֹן? אֶלְא שְׂמַע מִינָה – אִשְׁאָרָא.

The Gemara comments: **So too, it is reasonable** that this is the case, **from the fact that the mishna also teaches: And vessels that are touching a corpse.** Now do people who touch **these vessels require sprinkling?**^H Does one who touches a vessel that is ritually impure from a corpse require the sprinkling of purification water? This individual is impure only until that evening. **Rather, learn from this that the halakha that he is sprinkled on the third and on the seventh days does not refer to all the cases in the mishna but only to some of the others.**

In a chest, a box, or a cabinet – **בְּשִׁדָּה תִּיבָה וּמַגְדָּל**: One who enters the land of the nations in a chest, a box, or a cabinet that does not come in contact with the ground is rendered ritually impure, as a moving tent is not considered a tent. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Met* 11:5).

Perek VII
Daf 55 Amud a

לֵימָא כְּתַנָּיִי: הַנִּכְנֵס לְאֶרְצָא הַעֲמִימִים בְּשִׁדָּה תִּיבָה וּמַגְדָּל, רַבִּי מְטַמֵּא, וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מְטַהֵר. מֵאִי לָא רַבִּי סָבַר מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא, וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבַר מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא?

Let us say that this is parallel to a dispute between *tanna'im*, as it is taught: With regard to **one who enters the land of the nations not on foot but in a chest, a box, or a cabinet**,^H **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi deems him ritually impure. And Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, deems him pure. What, is it not correct to say that they disagree in this regard: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who deems him impure, holds that the Sages decreed impurity with regard to the air, and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, holds that the Sages decreed impurity with regard to the earth, and consequently he is not impure, as the container prevents him from overlying the impurity?**

לָא, דְּכֹלֵי עֲלָמָא מְשֻׁם אִוְרָא, מִן סָבַר: אַהֲלִי זְרוּק שְׂמִיָּה אַהֲלִי, וּמִן סָבַר: לָא שְׂמִיָּה אַהֲלִי.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: This is **not** necessarily the correct interpretation of their dispute, as one can say **that everyone agrees that the decree is with regard to the earth, and their dispute concerns only the case of one who enters in a chest, a box, or a cabinet. One Sage, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, holds that a moving tent, an item that serves as a tent as it passes over ritual impurity, is called a tent, and therefore a person who enters the land of the nations in a large container is protected from its impurity. And one Sage, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, holds that a moving tent is not called a tent. Consequently, nothing separates this individual from the impurity, and he becomes impure by overlying the land of the nations.**