

”ומתחיל ומונה.” אמר רב חסדא:  
לא שנו אלא בנזירות מועטת, אבל  
בנזירות מרובה – מיסלק נמי סלקין  
ליה.

**S** The mishna taught that a nazirite who became ritually impure through sources of impurity that do not cause him to forfeit his naziriteship, including his days of leprosy, **starts counting** again from the day of his purification, as his period of impurity does not count toward his naziriteship. **Rav Ḥisda said: They taught this halakha of a leper only with regard to a short naziriteship** of thirty days, as he shaves his hair for purification from leprosy, and therefore he must count an additional thirty days to allow his hair to grow sufficiently to shave for his naziriteship. **However, with regard to a lengthy naziriteship**, when thirty days or more remain in his naziriteship after having shaved for his leprosy, those days **also count toward his term**, and he need not recount his days as a leper.

מתניב רב שרביא: מתחיל ומונה מיד,  
ואין מבטל בהן את הקודמין. במאי?  
אילימא בנזירות מועטת – קבעי  
גידול שיער!

Rav Sherevya raises an objection from the mishna: **He starts counting immediately, and he does not negate the earlier days due to them. To what case is the mishna referring? If we say it is referring to a short naziriteship, he requires a thirty-day period of hair growth**, and as he shaved for purification of his leprosy, he must negate the earlier days as a practical manner, to enable his hair to regrow.

Perek VII  
Daf 55 Amud b

אָלָא לָאוּ בְּנִזְרוּת מְרֻבָּה, וְקָתְנִי:  
מִתְחִיל וּמוֹנֵה מִיָּד! הוּא מוֹתִיב לָהּ,  
וְהוּא מְפָרֵק לָהּ: בְּנִזְרוּת בֵּת חֲמִשִּׁים  
יוֹם, דִּיתִיב עֲשָׂרִין וְאִיתִילֵידָא בֵּיהּ  
צָרְעָת. מְגַלַּח צָרְעָתוֹ וְהֵדֵר יִתִּיב  
תְּלַתִּין יוֹמִין דְּנֹזֵר, דְּהָא אֵית לֵיהּ  
גִידוֹל שִׁיעָר.

Rather, is it not the case that the mishna is referring to a **lengthy naziriteship**, and nevertheless it teaches: **He starts counting immediately**, which indicates that his time as a leper is not included? Rav Sherevya raised the objection and he resolved it: The mishna is referring to a **naziriteship of fifty days**,<sup>N</sup> in a case where he sat and observed **twenty** days of his vow, and at that point he **developed leprosy**. In that case, he **shaves for his leprosy, and he again sits for thirty days as a nazirite**. The problem of thirty days' hair growth does not arise in this situation, as at the end of this period there is hair growth of thirty days.

מתניב רמי בר חמא: נזיר שהיה טמא  
בספק ומוחלט בספק

Rami bar Ḥama raised an objection from a mishna (59b): With regard to a nazirite who has **uncertain impurity** from a corpse and whose status as a **confirmed leper is uncertain**,

Perek VII  
Daf 56 Amud a

אוכל בקדשים לאחר ששים יום.

he eats sacrificial food after sixty days,<sup>N</sup> when the status of uncertain leprosy has passed, and when he has completed all his obligations of naziriteship. He cannot shave for his leprosy right away, as he might be a pure nazirite, and the status of uncertain leprosy does not override naziriteship. Instead, after thirty days he shaves for his uncertain status as a confirmed leper and for his uncertain status as a pure nazirite. Once again, he is not permitted to shave a second time seven days later for the shaving done by a leper as part of his purification process in case he was not a leper but impure. Were that the case, it would mean that the previous shaving was for his impurity, and therefore he would be required observe naziriteship in purity for thirty days. At the conclusion of this period, i.e., the sixtieth day, he shaves and may eat sacrificial food on the following day, as even if he was a full-fledged leper he has now shaved twice.

NOTES

A naziriteship of fifty days – נזירות בת חמשים יום: According to this explanation, the phrase: A short naziriteship, does not refer to the entire length of the vow, which is of no importance with regard to this issue, but to the days remaining for his naziriteship after shaving for his leprosy. If this period is thirty days or less, it is called a short naziriteship, and in practice he will necessarily have to observe more days so that he has thirty days of hair growth. If enough days are left in the naziriteship, he does not have to negate any days for the sake of his hair growth.

NOTES

אוכל בקדשים – לאחר ששים יום: He cannot partake of sacrificial food beforehand, as he may be a leper who lacks atonement. Therefore, he must bring his offerings of purification before he can eat sacrificial food. It is important to note that only those lacking atonement whose impurity is inherent, e.g., a leper or a zav, are included in this category. However, other people who must bring offerings, e.g., nazirites, may partake of sacrificial food.

וְשׂוֹתָהּ יַיִן וּמִי־טֵמֵא לַמֵּתִים לְאַחַר מֵאָה  
וְעֶשְׂרִים יוֹם.

And he drinks wine and may become impure to bury a corpse after 120 days. In other words, this individual has not yet completed his naziriteship vow, as he might have been a confirmed leper, in which case both his acts of shaving would have counted for his leprosy. He therefore waits another thirty days and proceeds to shave on day ninety. Even at that stage, he may not yet drink wine or contract ritual impurity from a corpse, as he might have been impure, which would mean that his third shaving was for his impurity. Consequently, he counts another period of thirty days for his naziriteship of purity, at the end of which he may perform the shaving of purity, drink wine, and become impure from a corpse, 120 days from the start of his naziriteship.

וְתַנִּי עֲלֶיהָ: בְּמֵה דְבָרִים אֲמוּרִים – בְּנִיּוֹת  
מוֹעֲטָת, אֲבָל בְּנִיּוֹת בַּת שָׁנָה – אוֹכֵל  
בְּקֻדְשִׁים לְאַחַר שְׁתֵּי שָׁנִים,

And it is taught in the *Tosefta* (6:1) with regard to that mishna: In what case is this statement said? With regard to a short naziriteship of thirty days. However, with regard to a naziriteship of a year, he eats sacrificial food after two years. He cannot shave until a year has passed, in case he is not a leper, and he may shave the second time only after a second year, in case he was ritually impure, and this was his naziriteship observed in purity. After two years, he may eat sacrificial meat, for if he was a full-fledged leper he has shaved twice.

וְשׂוֹתָהּ יַיִן וּמִי־טֵמֵא לַמֵּתִים לְאַחַר אַרְבַּע  
שָׁנִים.

However, if the first two shavings were for his leprosy, he has not shaved for his naziriteship at all, and therefore he must observe an additional year, shave, and observe another year of naziriteship, as perhaps his third shaving was for impurity and the other for his naziriteship in purity. And consequently, he may drink wine and become impure to bury a corpse after four years.

וְאִי סֵלְקָא דְעֵתְךָ סֵלְקִין לִיה יוּמֵי – תִּסְגִּי  
לִיה בְּשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים וּשְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם!

And if it enters your mind that the days during which he was ritually impure count toward his naziriteship, it should be enough for him to observe three years and thirty days. Due to uncertainty, he cannot shave for his leprosy until a year has passed, in case he was a pure nazirite, and he must wait another year for his second shaving, as he might have been an impure nazirite. However, at that point, if the days of his counting are considered part of his naziriteship, as claimed by Rav Hisda, he should be allowed to wait a mere thirty days for hair growth, shave for his impure naziriteship, and then add a final year for his naziriteship in purity. The fact that he is obligated to wait four years proves that his time as a leper does not count toward his naziriteship.

וְעוֹד מְתִיב רַב אֲשִׁי: אִין לִי אֶלָּא יְמֵי  
טוּמְאָה שְׂאִין עוֹלִין לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן. יְמֵי  
חִלּוּטוֹ מִנְיָן? וְדִין הוּא: יְמֵי טוּמְאָה מְגַלַּח  
וּמִבִּיא קֶרְבָּן. וְיְמֵי חִלּוּטוֹ מְגַלַּח וּמִבִּיא  
קֶרְבָּן. מַה יְמֵי טוּמְאָתוֹ אִין עוֹלִין לוֹ מִן  
הַמִּנְיָן – אֶף יְמֵי חִלּוּטוֹ אִין עוֹלִין לוֹ מִן  
הַמִּנְיָן.

And Rav Ashi raised a further objection from the following halachic midrash: I have derived only that the days of impurity<sup>n</sup> do not count as part of his tally of his naziriteship. From where do I derive that the days of his status as a confirmed leper also do not count toward his naziriteship? And is this not logical: After the days of impurity he shaves and brings an offering, and after his days of confirmed leprosy he likewise shaves and brings an offering; just as his days of impurity do not count as part of his tally, so too, the days of confirmed leprosy should not count as part of his tally.

לֹא, אִם אָמַרְתָּ בִּימֵי טוּמְאָתוֹ – שָׁבֹן  
מִבְּטֵל בְּהֵן אֶת הַקּוּדְמִים, תֹּאמַר בִּימֵי  
חִלּוּטוֹ שְׂאִין מִבְּטֵל בְּהֵן אֶת הַקּוּדְמִין!

The Gemara rejects this argument: No, if you say that this is true with regard to his days of impurity, which negate the previous days, shall you also say that this is the case with regard to his days of confirmed leprosy, which do not negate the previous ones, as stated in the mishna?

אָמַרְתָּ: קָל וְחוֹמֵר הוּא: וּמַה נוֹיֵר בְּקֶבֶר,  
שְׂשֻׁעְרוֹ רָאוּי לְתַגְלַחַת נְזִירוֹת – אִין עוֹלִין  
לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן. יְמֵי חִלּוּטוֹ, שְׂאִין שְׂעוֹרָא  
לְתַגְלַחַת נְזִירוֹת – לֹא כָּל שָׁבֹן?!

The Gemara suggests another proof. You can say it is an *a fortiori* inference: And if a nazirite who uttered his vow when he was in a ritually impure place, e.g., a place of a grave, whose hair is fit for the shaving<sup>n</sup> of naziriteship, and yet those days when he was impure do not count as part of his tally, then with regard to his days of confirmed leprosy, when his hair is not fit for the shaving of naziriteship, as he must first perform the shaving of leprosy, is it not all the more so that they should not count toward his naziriteship?

#### NOTES

אִין – I have derived only that the days of impurity – יְמֵי טוּמְאָה: These are his days of impurity from a corpse, as the Torah clearly states that they must be completely negated (see Numbers 6:12).

שְׂשֻׁעְרוֹ רָאוּי לְתַגְלַחַת – Whose hair is fit for the shaving – He does not have to shave this hair at the end of his period as an impure nazirite. Although he must observe thirty days of naziriteship in purity afterward, he shaves the hair that grew in impurity only because he shaves for his naziriteship of purity, as explained above (16b).

ואין לי אלא ימי חלוטו, ימי ספרו ממני?  
ודין הוא:

And I have derived only his days of confirmed leprosy. From where do I derive that his days of counting for purification from leprosy are not considered part of his term either? And is this not logical:

Perek VII  
Daf 56 Amud b

מה ימי חלוטו טעון תגלחת – אף ימי ספרו, ומה ימי חלוטו אין עולין לו מן המנין – אף ימי ספרו.

Just as the days of his confirmed leprosy require shaving, so too, the days of his counting require shaving; and just as the days of his confirmed leprosy do not count as part of his tally of naziriteship, so too, the days of his counting should not count toward his term of naziriteship?

יכול אף ימי הסגרו בן? והדין נותן: חלוט מטמא משכב ומושב, וימי הסגרו מטמא משכב ומושב, אם למדת לימי חלוטו שאין עולין לו מן המנין – אף ימי הסגרו אין עולין לו מן המנין.

One might have thought that even his days of quarantine as a leper should share the same *halakha* and not be counted. And it is logical that those days should not count for him either, as the two states are comparable: A confirmed leper renders items ritually impure through lying or sitting,<sup>h</sup> and a leper in the days of his quarantine also renders items impure through lying or sitting. Consequently, if you learned with regard to the days of confirmed leprosy that they do not count as part of his tally, so too, the days of quarantine should not count as part of his tally either.

אמרת: לא, אם אמרת בימי חלוטו – שכן חלוטו טעון תגלחת ומביא קרבן – לפיכך אין עולין, תאמר בימי הסגרו שאין טעון תגלחת ואינו מביא קרבן – לפיכך יעלו למנין.

The Gemara rejects this argument: You can say in response: No, if you said this *halakha* with regard to the days of confirmed leprosy, the reason is that his confirmed state of leprosy requires him to shave<sup>h</sup> after he is healed and to bring an offering before he can commence his naziriteship. Therefore, these days do not count toward his naziriteship. However, will you say the same with regard to the days of his quarantine, which do not require shaving and for which he does not bring an offering? Therefore, perhaps they should count toward his tally.

מכאן אמרו: ימי ספרו וימי גמרו – אין עולין לו מן המנין. אבל ימי הזב והזבה, והסגרו של מצורע – הרי אלו עולין לו.

From here they stated: The days of a leper's counting<sup>h</sup> and the days of his confirmed leprosy, when he is a full-fledged leper, do not count as part of his tally of his term of naziriteship. However, the days of the impurity of the *zav* and the *zava*<sup>n</sup> and the days of a leper's quarantine do count as part of his tally of his term of naziriteship.

קתני מיהת: לא, אם אמרת בימי טומאה שכן מבטל בהן את הקודמין, תאמר בימי חלוטו. במאי? אילימא בבגירות מועטת – הא בעינן גידול שער.

With regard to the issue at hand, in any event the *baraita* teaches: No, if you say that this is true with regard to his days of impurity, which negate the previous days, shall you also say that this is the case with regard to his days of confirmed leprosy, which do not negate the previous ones? The Gemara analyzes this argument: To what does this statement refer? If we say it is referring to a short naziriteship of thirty days, this cannot be the case, as we require hair growth of thirty days after his purification.

אלא לאו – בבגירות מרובה, וקתני: שאין עולין לו מן המנין, אלמא: לא סלקין ליה, שמע מינה.

Rather, is it not the case that it is referring to a lengthy naziriteship, and nevertheless the *baraita* teaches that they do not count as part of his tally. Apparently, his days as a full-fledged leper do not count toward his term of naziriteship, which contradicts Rav Hisda's ruling. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this that Rav Hisda's opinion should be rejected.

HALAKHA

A confirmed leper renders items ritually impure through lying or sitting, etc. – חלוט מטמא משכב ומושב וכו': A leper imparts impurity by lying and sitting. This *halakha* applies both to a full-fledged leper and a quarantined leper, as their impurity is similar in all regards (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Tumat Tzara'at* 10:10–11).

חלוטו – ימי ספרו וכו': His confirmed state requires him to shave, etc. – ימי ספרו וכו': A leper who was purified after his quarantine is required to shave and bring birds for his purification. If he was declared pure by a priest after a period of quarantine he does not have to shave or bring an offering (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Tumat Tzara'at* 10:10).

ימי ספרו וכו' – ימי ספרו וכו': If a nazirite became a confirmed leper, none of his days as a full-fledged leper, or the seven days he counts between his two shavings of leprosy, count toward his term of naziriteship. The *halakha* is in accordance with the ruling of the *baraita*, not the opinion of Rav Hisda. Nevertheless, the days of his quarantine are considered part of his term of naziriteship. Similarly, the days of impurity of a *zav* and *zava* count toward their naziriteship terms (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:9).

NOTES

The days of the *zav* and the *zava* – ימי הזב והזבה: Although a *zav* and *zava* are obligated to bring an offering upon their purification, they need not shave, and therefore their cases are not comparable to that of a confirmed leper or the days of

his counting. One certainly cannot derive the *halakha* of a nazirite from a leper's days of quarantine, as the latter are followed neither by shaving nor by bringing offerings of purity.

## HALAKHA

Any impurity from a corpse, etc. – כל טומאה מן המת – זכר: Any ritual impurity from a corpse that obligates a nazirite to shave also renders one liable to receive *karet* for entering the Temple. One does not violate the prohibition against entering the Temple in a state of impurity if he came into contact with those sources of impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite does not have to shave. However, if one touches a person or vessels that were rendered impure in a manner for which a nazirite must shave, he is liable if he subsequently enters the Temple (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Biat HaMikdash* 3:13 and see Ra'avad and *Kesef Mishne* there).

## PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Yehoshua bar Memel – רבי יהושע בר ממל: This *tanna*, who is mentioned only in the *Tosefta*, was apparently a disciple of Rabbi Yehoshua. Rabbi Meir praised him as a master of *halakhot*.

## BACKGROUND

Ardaskeya – ערדסקיא: Ardaskeya, or Ardaskos, is the name of a village located not far from the town of Tavin, also known as Tivon, in northern Israel near Haifa.

## LANGUAGE

Petter Rosh – פתור ראש: Apparently this is from a Greek name that was Hebraicized. Other versions of the Gemara read: Petora. The Greek name in question is possibly πατρώος, Patroos, meaning of the father, or πάτρωος, Patros, meaning one's father's brother.

**מתני'** אמר רבי אליעזר משום רבי יהושע: כל טומאה מן המת שנוזר מגלח עליה – חייבין עליה על ביאת מקדש, וכל טומאה מן המת שאין הנוזר מגלח עליה – אין חייבין עליה על ביאת מקדש.

אמר רבי מאיר: לא תהא זו קלה מן השרץ.

**גמ'** ורבי אליעזר משום רבי יהושע גמר לה? והא משום רבי יהושע בר ממל גמר לה. דתנאי, אמר רבי אליעזר: בשהלכותי לערדסקיא מצאתי את רבי יהושע בן פתור ראש שהיה יושב ודן לפני רבי מאיר בהלכה: כל טומאה מן המת שהנוזר מגלח עליה – חייבין עליה משום ביאת מקדש, וכל טומאה מן המת שאין הנוזר מגלח עליה – אין חייבין עליה משום ביאת מקדש. אמר לו: אל תהא זו קלה משרץ!

אמרתי לו: כלום אתה בקי ברבי יהושע בר ממל? אמר לי: הן. כך אמר לי רבי יהושע בר ממל משום רבי יהושע: כל טומאה מן המת שהנוזר מגלח עליה – חייב עליה משום ביאת מקדש, וכל טומאה מן המת שאין הנוזר מגלח עליה – אין חייבין עליה משום ביאת מקדש. הוי משום רבי יהושע בר ממל גמיר לה!

**MISHNA** Rabbi Eliezer said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: With regard to any ritual impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite must shave, one is liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting that impurity. If someone who became impure from one of those sources of impurity enters the Temple, he violates the prohibition against an impure individual entering the sacred space. **And with regard to any impurity from a corpse<sup>HN</sup> for which a nazirite does not shave, one is likewise not liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting it.**

Rabbi Meir said: This impurity from a corpse that does not obligate a nazirite to shave **should not be more lenient than the impurity of a creeping animal.** The Torah clearly states that one rendered impure from a creeping animal is prohibited from entering the Temple (see Leviticus 5:2–3).

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks: **And did Rabbi Eliezer learn this halakha in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya? But didn't he learn it in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua bar Memel? As it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer said: When I went to a place called Ardaskeya,<sup>B</sup> I found Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petter Rosh<sup>l</sup> sitting and discussing the following halakha before Rabbi Meir: With regard to any ritual impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite must shave, one is liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting it. And with regard to any impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite does not shave, one is not liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting it. Rabbi Meir said to him: This impurity of a corpse that does not obligate a nazirite to shave **should not be more lenient than the impurity of a creeping animal.****

Rabbi Eliezer continued: **I said to Rabbi Meir: Are you at all familiar with Rabbi Yehoshua bar Memel? He said to me: Yes.** I continued: **Rabbi Yehoshua bar Memel said this to me in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya: With regard to any ritual impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite must shave, one is liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting it. And with regard to any impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite does not shave, one is not liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting it.** This concludes the *baraita*. The Gemara comments: **This is proof that Rabbi Eliezer learned this halakha in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua bar Memel, not directly from Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya.**

## NOTES

**יכל טומאה מן המת וכו'**: The reason for this *halakha* is unclear. Many commentaries maintain that one should not seek an explanation for it, as it is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. In other words, there is no fundamental connection between the sources of ritual impurity for which a nazirite must shave and those which render one liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple. The mishna gives the rule comparing the two merely as a kind of mnemonic. It is also possible that this comparison is based on the fact that an offering is brought for entering the Temple in a state of impurity

and a nazirite must likewise sacrifice offerings. See the Jerusalem Talmud for a lengthy discussion on this issue.

One extreme opinion is that those items that do not obligate a nazirite to shave are all sources of impurity by rabbinic law (Rambam). However, the Meiri contends that this mishna indicates otherwise, as how could Rabbi Meir suggest that sources of impurity by rabbinic law should be more severe than that of a creeping animal, which is by Torah law? However, as Rabbi Meir's opinion is not accepted by the Rambam as *halakha*, it is possible that he rejects the source of his reasoning as well.



**Nahum the Scribe – נחום הלבלר**: Nahum the Scribe was a *tanna* from the Second Temple period. He was a contemporary of Rabban Gamliel the Elder, grandson of Hillel. Nahum the Scribe is mentioned only once in the Mishna.

**Rabbi Meyasha – רבי מיאשא**: Rabbi Meyasha was one of the first *tanna'im*. He is listed among the disciples of Hillel and Shammai (*Seder HaDorot*).

## LANGUAGE

Scribe [*lavlar*] – לבלר: From the Latin *librarius*, meaning scribe.

## NOTES

With regard to one who sows dill and mustard – בורע שבת וחרדל: Most early commentaries reject this reading of the text in favor of the version that appears in a different mishna in *Pe'a* (3:2). According to that version, the tradition is referring to one who sows two types of wheat in a field. Their status with regard to *pe'a* depends on whether one brought the grain into one granary or two.

אָמרו: שָׁמַע מִיָּנָה, כָּל שִׁמְעֵתָא דְּמִתְאַמְרָה  
בְּבֵי תַלְתָּא, קִדְמָאֵי וּבִתְרָאֵי – אָמְרִינָן,  
מִצִּיעָאֵי – לֹא אָמְרִינָן.

**They said: Learn from this case the following principle: With regard to any statement of *halakha* that was stated as a tradition of three scholars, we say the first and the last names in the chain but we do not say the middle one.** Therefore, the mishna mentions the name of Rabbi Eliezer, the last link in the tradition, and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya, the first scholar, but it omits that of Rabbi Yehoshua bar Memel, the middle scholar in the chain.

אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: אִף אֲנִי נִמְי תְּנִינָא,  
אָמַר נַחְוִים הִלְבְּלָר: כִּד מְקוּבְלָנִי מִרְבִּי  
מִיָּאשָׁא, שְׂקִיבֵל מֵאבָּא, שְׂקִיבֵל מִן הַזּוּגוֹת,  
שְׂקִיבֵלוּ מִן הַנְּבִיאִים: הִלְכָה לְמוֹשֶׁה מִסִּינַי  
בְּזוֹרַע שֶׁבֶת וְחֶרְדֵּל בְּשְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשָׁה מְקוּמוֹת,  
שְׁנוֹתַן פְּאָה מְכַל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד.

**Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: We, too, learn in a mishna (*Pe'a* 2:6): Nahum the Scribe<sup>p</sup> [*lavlar*]<sup>l</sup> said: This is the tradition that I received from Rabbi Meyasha,<sup>p</sup> who received it from father, who received it from the pairs of Sages who served during the period of the Second Temple, who received it from the Prophets: It is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai with regard to one who sows the plants of dill<sup>b</sup> and mustard<sup>n</sup> in two or three separate locations in a single field, that he leaves a corner<sup>b</sup> to the poor for each and every one of these plots on its own, rather than one corner for all of them.**

וְאִילוּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וְכָלֵב לֹא קָחְשִׁיב, שָׁמַע מִיָּנָה.

The Gemara explains the proof from this source: **And yet Nahum the Scribe does not mention the names of Joshua and Caleb, despite the fact that they were the Elders who passed down this *halakha* from Moses to the Prophets. Learn from this that the middle links in a tradition are not necessarily listed.**

מתני' אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא: דְּנִתִּי לְפָנֵי רַבִּי  
אֱלִיעֶזֶר: מָה אִם עֵצָם בְּשַׁעוֹרָה שְׂאִינוּ  
מְטַמָּא אָדָם בְּאֵהָל – הַנְּזִיר מְגַלַּח עַל מַגְעוֹ  
וְעַל מִשְׁאוֹ, רַבִּיעִית דָּם שְׁהוּא מְטַמָּא אָדָם  
בְּאֵהָל – אִינוּ דִּין שִׁיְהֵא הַנְּזִיר מְגַלַּח עַל  
מַגְעָה וְעַל מִשְׁאָה?

**MISHNA** The mishna continues to address the sources of ritual impurity for which a nazirite must shave. **Rabbi Akiva said: I discussed this matter before Rabbi Eliezer and suggested the following *a fortiori* inference: If, with regard to a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk, which does not render a person impure in a tent, a nazirite must nevertheless shave for touching it or carrying it, then in the case of a quarter-log of blood, which is more stringent in that it renders a person impure in a tent, is it not logical that a nazirite should shave for touching it or carrying it?**

אָמַר לִי: מַה זֶה עֲקִיבָא?! אִין דְּנִין כָּאן מִקַּל  
וְחוֹמֵר. וּבְשַׁבְּבָתִי וְהִרְצִיתִי דְּבָרִים לְפָנֵי רַבִּי  
יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, אָמַר לִי: יִפְהָ אֲמַרְתָּ, אֵלֶּא כֵּן אָמְרוּ:  
הִלְכָה.

**Rabbi Eliezer said to me: What is this, Akiva? One cannot argue by means of an *a fortiori* inference here, in this particular case. However, Rabbi Eliezer did not provide a reason for this response. Rabbi Akiva continued: And when I came and presented these matters before Rabbi Yehoshua, he said to me: You spoke well, i.e., your logic is flawless, but they indeed said that this is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, which cannot be refuted by means of an *a fortiori* inference.**

## BACKGROUND

**Dill – שֶׁבֶת**: Dill, *Anethum graveolens*, is a perennial grassy herb from the Apiaceae family. This plant grows to a height of 50–80 cm and has small yellow flowers. Mesh-shaped in appearance, its leaves are trim and form thread-like tongues. Dill has a distinctive, pleasant fragrance. Its seeds and oil are used for medicinal purposes. In the mishnaic period, dill was grown in gardens, and it is still cultivated nowadays in many places. Dill also grows wild in certain parts of the world.

**Corner – פְּאָה**: The Torah states that a farmer is prohibited from harvesting the produce in the corner of his field. Instead, he must allow the poor to collect this produce for themselves. The Sages decreed that the area of the corner must be at least one-sixtieth of the field. This mitzva appears in the Torah (Leviticus 19:9, 23:22), and tractate *Pe'a* is devoted to discussing its details. By Torah law, fields, vineyards, and olive groves are included in the mitzva.



Field of cultivated dill