

## VIII.

---

### BAVLI TRACTATE NAZIR CHAPTER EIGHT

#### FOLIOS 57A-61A

##### 8:1A-E

- A. Two Nazirites, to whom someone said, “I saw one of you made unclean, but I don’t know which one of you it was” —
  - B. they cut their hair and bring an offering [owed by a Nazirite] because of uncleanness and an offering because of cleanness.
  - C. And each one of them says, “If it was I who was unclean, the offering because of uncleanness is mine, and the offering because of cleanness is yours. And if it was I who was the clean one, then the offering of cleanness is mine, and the offering of uncleanness is yours.”
  - D. Then they count out thirty days and bring an offering because of cleanness.
  - E. And each one of them says, “If it was I who was unclean, the offering because of uncleanness was mine and the offering of cleanness was yours, and this offering is now because of my being clean. But if it was I who was the clean one, the offering because of uncleanness was mine, and the offering because of cleanness was yours, and this offering now is because of your being clean.”
- I.1 A.** *The Mishnah-formulation states: Two Nazirites, to whom someone said, “I saw one of you made unclean, but I don’t know which one of you it was” — but why should this be the case [that each of them has to take account of the possibility that he has contracted uncleanness]? The rule covering every matter of doubt concerning uncleanness in the private domain [where cases of uncleanness subject to doubt are resolved in favor of uncleanness] — from whence do we derive it? It is derived from [the analogy provided by] the case of the wife accused of unfaithfulness. Hence we may argue: Just as in the case of the accused wife, only the one who commits the sexual act and the one upon whom it is committed are together [there being no eye-witness as to what has taken place], in a situation in which there are two persons present, [so we should require those same conditions to be met]. But here, there are the two Nazirites and this third party who is located near them, so lo, there are three persons present. In that case we deal with a matter of doubt concerning uncleanness that takes place in public domain [such as is constituted by three or more persons], and, we know,*

every matter of doubt involving uncleanness in public domain is resolved in favor of cleanness.

- B. Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “We deal with a case in which he says, ‘I saw a source of uncleanness tossed between you’ [Klien: and the third person was at a distance, so the conditions for private domain, two persons only being present, have been met].”
- C. *Said R. Ashi, “A close reading of the Mishnah-paragraph yields the same result, for that is the formulation of the Tannaite authority: [57B] but I don’t know which one of you it was.”*
- D. *That proves the point.*

**II.1 A. they cut their hair and bring both an offering owed by a Nazirite because of uncleanness and an offering because of cleanness:**

- B. *But why should they cut their hair at all? Maybe they’re not unclean at all, in which case they will have [needlessly, and in violation of the Torah] rounded the corners of the head [forbidden except to the Nazirite or to the person afflicted with the skin ailment, cf. Lev. 19:27]!*
- C. Said Samuel, “We deal with the case of a woman or child [who are not subject to that prohibition.]”
- D. *Why not regard the law as speaking of an adult male Nazirite, in the theory that rounding the entire head is not considered a violation of the negative commandment against rounding?*
- E. *Since Samuel does not interpret the law in that way, it yields the inference that Samuel takes the view that rounding the entire head is not considered a violation of the negative commandment against rounding.*
- F. *Mar Zutra repeated this tradition of Samuel with reference to a later passage of the Mishnah: A Nazirite who was subject to doubt as to being made unclean [on the day he took the vow] and subject to doubt as to being a confirmed [victim of sara’at] eats Holy Things after sixty days [= two Nazirite periods]. And he drinks wine and contracts corpse uncleanness after a hundred-and-twenty days [four Nazirite periods]. And he cuts the hair four times. [For cutting of the hair in the case of a nega’-sara’at overrides the prohibition against cutting the hair of the Nazirite only when the sara’at is certain. But in a case when it is subject to doubt, it does not override the other] [M. 8:2A-E]. Now why should this be the law? They are practicing a rounding of the head!*
- G. ] Said Samuel, “We deal with the case of a woman or child [who are not subject to that prohibition.]”

**Topical Composite on the Theme of Cutting the Hair,  
Head and Body Alike**

- II.2 A.** Said R. Huna, “He who rounds the head of a minor — lo, he is liable [of violating the negative commandment.]”
- B. *Said R. Ada bar Ahbah to R. Huna, “And as to your children, who shaves their heads?”*
- C. *He said to him, “Hobah.”*

- D. *“Then Hobah will bury her children.” [If a man cannot do it, a woman cannot either.]*
- E. *All the years that R. Ada was alive, no child of R. Huna survived.*
- F. *Since both authorities [Huna and Ada] concur that rounding the whole of the head is classified as rounding and forbidden, what is at issue between them?*
- G. *R. Huna takes the view, “The verse, ‘You shall not round the corners of your heads nor mar the corners of your beard’ (Lev. 29:27) means, whoever is subject to the prohibition of marring [the corners of the beard] is subject to the prohibition of rounding the head, and women, since they are not subject to the prohibition of marring the beard, also are not subject to the prohibition of rounding the head.”*
- H. *And R. Ada bar Ahbah takes the view, “All the same are rounding the head and having the head rounded: both are subject to the prohibition, and the one who does the rounding is treated as analogous to the one who has it done: in any situation in which the one who has it done is subject to liability, the one who does it also is subject to liability, and this minor, since he himself is not subject to penalty, so the one who rounds the head also is not subject to penalty.” {So an adult can do it to a child and be free of penalty.]*

**II.3** A. *May we say that the rule governing the rounding of the entire head is subject to a Tannaite dispute, for our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **“His head” (Lev. 14: 9) — why does Scripture say so? Because it is said, “A razor shall not pass across his [the Nazir’s] head” (Num. 6: 5), [58A] might I think that this [prohibition] applies even though a Nazirite is afflicted with plague? Scripture says, “His head” (Lev. 14: 9) [Sifra 151/Parashat Mesora Pereq 2/3].**
- C. *And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **“His head” (Lev. 14: 9) — why does Scripture say so? Since it is said with reference to a Nazirite, “A razor shall not pass across the Nazir’s head” (Num. 6: 5), I might have thought that the same rule applies to a Nazirite who is afflicted with the plague. That is why Scripture says, “His head” [to indicate that even a Nazirite must shave his head if he becomes afflicted with the skin ailment].**
- E. *Now it is not what is at issue in the Tannaite conflict before us: the one who builds his reading on the case of the Nazirite takes the view that rounding the entire head is not subject to the prohibition of rounding, and when Scripture comes along, it is for a negative commandment to override a positive one. And the other authority takes the view that rounding off the entire head is subject to the prohibition of rounding, and when Scripture comes along, it is to override a negative commandment alone?*
- F. *Said Raba, “All parties concur that rounding off the entire head is not classified as rounding off such as is prohibited, and when Scripture comes along, it is to deal with the case in which he*

*rounded the head, and then he shaved the rest of the head. Since if he had shaved it off at the same time as rounding the head, he would not have been liable to violating the prohibition, when he rounded the head and then shaved it also he is not liable."*

- G. *But did Scripture make such a statement [permitting the violation of a prohibition when it can be avoided]? And has not R. Simeon b. Laqish said: "In any passage in which you find a positive and a negative commandment, if you can carry out both of them, well and good, but if not, then let the positive commandment come and override the negative commandment"?*
- H. *Rather, all parties concur that rounding off the entire head is classified as rounding off and forbidden, and the one who invokes the verse "his head" to prove that a positive commandment overrides both a negative commandment and a positive commandment takes the view that a simple prohibition can be overridden on the basis of the commandment about wearing twisted cords, deriving it from the commandment to wear knotted cords, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: "You shall not wear a mingled fabric of linen and wool together" (Deu. 22:11) — and nonetheless, "You shall make twisted knots of them" (Deu. 22:12).*
- I. *And as to the authority who derives this rule [that a positive commandment overrides a simple negative commandment], why does he not derive the rule from the case of the twisted cords?*
- J. *He will respond to you along the lines of what Raba proposed. For Raba contrasted verses as follows: "It is written, 'The corner' [which implies that the fringes are to be of] the same kind of material as the corner; but it is also written, 'wool and linen.' How so? Woolen threads along with linen threads carry out the obligation of a garment to have show fringes whether these garments are made of the same material or material of some other kind; other kinds of threads serve to fulfill the requirement of show fringes in a garment of the same material, but not in a garment of some other material."*
- K. *Now as to the Tannaite authority who derives from "his head" that a positive commandment overrides a simple prohibition, derive the fact that the positive commandment overrides both a prohibition and a positive commandment [such that, if the Nazirite contracts the skin ailment, he may shave his head when he recovers]?*
- L. *He derives it from the reference, "his beard" (Lev. 14: 9), as has been taught on Tannaite authority: :] "And his beard" (Lev. 14: 9): Why does Scripture say so? Because it is said, "The corner of their beard they*

**[priests] shall not shave” (Lev. 12: 5). Might one think that this is the case even if he is afflicted with plague? Scripture specifies, “His beard”(Lev. 14: 9) [Sifra 151/Parashat Mesora Perek 2/3].**

- M. *As to the one who derives the rule that a positive commandment and a negative commandment can be overruled by a positive commandment from “his head,” why should he not derive the rule from “his beard”?*
- N. *But by your reasoning [that we infer from “his beard” so that the case of the Nazirite who has contracted the skin ailment can be deduced from the case of the priest who has done so], so that when we have the rule elsewhere [58B] that a positive commandment cannot override a negative commandment accompanied by a positive commandment, why not infer that from the case of the priest afflicted by the skin ailment that it can override? [The question assumes there is no difference between this case and other cases].*
- O. *There is no possibility of deriving the rule from the priest, for what makes the priest special is that the prohibition that is overridden does not apply to everyone equally [but to priests and not common folk, and a prohibition that applies to all equally carries greater weight and if accompanied by a positive commandment ought not to be overridden]. And, further, we cannot derive the rule governing the Nazirite afflicted by the skin ailment from the priest afflicted by the skin ailment, since the prohibition overridden in the priest’s instance does not pertain equally to everybody.*
- P. *And as to the one who assigns the phrase “his head” to the Nazirite afflicted by the skin ailment — what need does he have for the reference to “his beard”?*
- Q. *He requires it in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: “Neither shall they shave off the corner of their beards” (Lev. 21: 5). Might that mean, even if they shaved it with scissors, they would be liable? Scripture states, “Neither shall you mar the corners of your beard.” Might one suppose that that is the case even if he plucks it with tweezers or with a plane? Scripture*

states, “Neither shall they shave off the corner of their beards” (Lev. 21: 5). How so? Shaving that also mars the beard is done with a razor [Sifra 151/Parashat Mesora Pereq 2/3]. [Klien: the phrase “his beard” teaches that the person afflicted with the skin ailment also must shave with a razor.]

- R. *And the Tannaite authority who utilizes the phrase “his head” to show that it may override a simple prohibition, why was it necessary for Scripture to specify both “his head” and “his beard”? “His head” can serve to imply a simple prohibition may be overridden and also a prohibition accompanied by a positive commandment, so it applies equally to both, and both could be inferred [without a reference to “his beard”].*
- S. *The case of the priest is not to be derived from the case of the Nazirite, for the Nazirite has the possibility of release through an inquiry to a sage, which is not the case for a priest. And the rule for the Nazirite cannot be derived from the case of the priest, for the priest is subject to negative commandments that do not apply to everyone. And we cannot derive from these a rule for other cases, since the objections already noted can be introduced [both of these representing special cases].*

**II.4 A.** Said Rab, “A man may thin the hair of his whole body with a razor.”

- B. *An objection was raised:* He who removes the hair of his armpits or his genitals is flogged.”
- C. The latter statement refers to doing so with a razor, the former, with scissors.
- D. *But lo, Rab made his statement with reference to a razor!*
- E. He meant, with something like a razor.

**II.5 A.** Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “He who removes the hair of the armpits or the genitals is flogged.”

- B. *An objection was raised:* Removing the hair is forbidden not by the authority of the Torah but by the authority of scribes.
- C. *What is the meaning of “flogged”?* It means, flogged on the authority of rabbis.
- D. **[59A]** *There are those who say,* said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “He who removes the hair of the armpits or the genitals is flogged on the count of, ‘neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment’ (Deu. 22: 5).”

- E. *An objection was raised:* Removing the hair is forbidden not by the authority of the Torah but by the authority of scribes.
- F. *The statement to the contrary is in accord with the Tannaite authority in the Tannaite statement that has been taught:* He who removes the hair of the armpits or the genitals is flogged on the count of, “neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment” (Deu. 22: 5).
- G. *And how does the initial Tannaite authority interpret that same verse, “neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment” (Deu. 22: 5)?*
- H. *He requires it in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. “Neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment” (Deu. 22: 5) — What is the intent of Scripture in making that statement? If it is to indicate that a man should not put on a woman’s garment and a woman the garment of a man, lo, it has already been stated, “This is an abomination” (Deu. 22: 5) — and here there is no abomination [which pertains only to actual intercourse].
- J. Rather, it means, a man should not put on a woman’s garment and take his place among women, and a woman the garment of a man and take her place among men.
- K. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “How do we know that a woman should not go out to wore armed for battle? Scripture states, ‘all not wear what pertains to a man.’ Then ‘Neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment’ — a man should not wear woman’s makeup.”

**II.6 A.** Said R. Nahman, “In the case of a Nazirite it is permitted [to shave the hair of the armpits].”

B. *But the decided law does not accord with his opinion.*

**II.7 A.** *Rabbis said to R. Simeon bar Abba, “We see that R. Yohanan has no [hair in his armpits].”*

B. On account of old age it has fallen out.

C. *A certain man was declared liable to flogging by the court of R. Ammi. When his armpits were bared [prior to the flogging], he saw that they were not shaved. R. Ammi said to them, “Release him. This man is one of the associates [who observe the law as rabbis do].”*

D. *Rab asked R. Hiyya, “What is the law as to shaving the armpits?”*

E. He said to him, “It is forbidden.”

F. He said to him, “But lo, it’s growing long [and uncomfortable].”

G. *He said to him, “Son of nobles, it is subject to its own time-limit. If it grows further, it will fall out.”*

H. Rab ask ed R. Hiyya, “What is the law as to scratching?”

I. He said to him, “It is forbidden.”

J. “What about scratching through the garment?”

K. He said to him, “It is permitted.”

L. *There are those who say, he asked him whether, during prayer, it is permitted to scratch through the garment.*



- M. He said to him, "It is forbidden,"
- N. *But that is not the decided law.*

## 8:1F-P

- F. [59B] If one of them died —
- G. said R. Joshua, "Let [the survivor] seek out someone from the market to take a vow as a Nazirite as his counterpart, and let him say, 'If I was unclean, lo, you are a Nazirite forthwith. And if I was clean, lo, you will be a Nazirite after thirty days.' Then they count thirty days and bring an offering because of uncleanness and an offering because of cleanness.
- H. "And he says, 'If I was the one who was unclean, the offering because of uncleanness is mine, and the offering because of cleanness is yours, and if I was the clean one, then the offering because of cleanness is mine, and the offering because of uncleanness is subject to doubt.'
- I. "And they count out another thirty days and bring an offering because of cleanness.
- J. "And he says, 'If I was the one who was unclean, then the offering because of uncleanness was mine, and the offering because of cleanness was yours, and this is the offering because of my being clean. And if I was the one who was clean, then the offering because of cleanness was mine, and the offering because of uncleanness is subject to doubt. And this is the offering because of your being clean.'"
- K. Said to him Ben Zoma, "But who in the world would agree to take a vow as a Nazirite to serve as his counterpart?"
- L. "But he [alone, the surviving Nazirite,] offers a sin offering of fowl and a burnt offering of cattle and says, 'Now if I was the unclean one, the sin offering is offered in fulfillment of my obligation, and the burnt offering is a free-will offering. But if I was the clean one, then the burnt offering is in fulfillment of my obligation, and the sin offering is subject to doubt.'
- M. "He counts out thirty days [more as a Nazir] and brings an offering because of cleanness and he says, 'If I was the unclean one, the first burnt offering was a free-will offering, and this one is in fulfillment of an obligation. But if I was the clean one, the first burnt offering was in fulfillment of an obligation, and this one is a free-will offering.
- N. "“and these are the rest of the offering [that I owe].”"
- O. Said R. Joshua, "This one turns out to bring his offerings in bits and pieces."
- P. But sages concurred with the opinion of Ben Zoma [M. 6:11].
- I.1** A. *[After counting two periods of thirty-day Naziriteships,] why not let him present the offerings?*
- B. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "R. Joshua made that statement only to sharpen the wits of the disciples."
- I.2** A. *[With reference to O,] said R. Nahman, "What would R. Joshua do in order to prevent the intestines from decomposing?" [Klien: if we were to do as Joshua suggestions, the fat of the intestines, which must be offered on the altar, would*



decompose while both Nazirites were being shaved prior to saving. Surely this is as great an objection as the bringing of the sacrifices at different times. Nahman points out that not merely is there no technical objection to the procedure of Ben Zoma, but Joshua's cannot even be considered preferable.]

## 8:2

- A. **A Nazirite who was subject to doubt as to being made unclean [on the day he took the vow] and subject to doubt as to being a confirmed [victim of sara'at]**
  - B. **eats Holy Things after sixty days [= two Nazirite periods].**
  - C. **And he drinks wine and contracts corpse uncleanness after a hundred-and-twenty days [four Nazirite periods].**
  - D. **For cutting of the hair in the case of a nega' [sara'at] overrides [the prohibition against] cutting the hair of the Nazirite [only] when [the [sara'at] is certain.**
  - E. **But in a case when it is subject to doubt, it does not override [the other].**
- I.1 A. [60A] A Tannaite statement: Under what circumstances? When he took the vow of a Nazir for thirty days [B.: a routine Naziriteship]. But if he took the vow as a Nazir for twelve months, he eats Holy Things only after two years have passed. And he drinks wine and contracts corpse-uncleanness after four years have passed [T. 6.1VV-YY]**
- B. *And a Tannaite statement in the same regard: And he cuts the hair four times. At the first hair cutting, he presents a pair of birds, a bird as a sin-offering and an animal as a burnt offering. At the second hair cutting, he presents a bird as a sin offering and an animal as a burnt offering. At the third he presents a bird as a sin offering and an animal as a burnt offering. At the fourth he presents the sacrifice [marking the conclusion of the Naziriteship] in a condition of cleanness.*
  - C. *You have said, As to the first hair cutting, he presents a pair of birds, a bird as a sin-offering and an animal as a burnt offering — for whichever way, he presents the correct offering.*
  - D. *For if he was certainly afflicted with the skin ailment but had not contracted corpse uncleanness, the bird offering fulfills his obligation and the sin offering of fowl is subject to doubt and goes off to be buried, and the burnt offering is classified as a free will offering. But to shave him in the next seven days [a second time] is not possible, for perhaps he is not certified as afflicted with the skin ailment, and the All-Merciful has said of the Nazirite, "No razor shall come upon his head until the days are fulfilled" (Num. 6: 5).*
  - E. *And if he is not afflicted with the skin ailment but had contracted uncleanness, the bird presented as a sin offering carries out his obligation, and, since they are prepared outside of the Temple court [Lev. 14:5], they do not fall into the category of unconsecrated animals prepared in the Temple courtyard [which would be forbidden]. The animal presented as a burnt offering is classified as a free will offering.*
  - F. *And if he is not confirmed as afflicted with the skin ailment and also has not contracted uncleanness, then the birds in any event are prepared outside the Temple court, the bird as a sin offering is buried, the animal as a burnt offering carries out his obligation as a Nazirite who has not contracted uncleanness.*

- G. *But lo, he has to offer a guilt offering!*
- H. *It is R. Simeon, who has said that he presents one and stipulates concerning it [that if a guilt offering is not required, the animal is a votive peace offering. Since Simeon is the author, there is no issue of a guilt offering (Klien).]*
- I. *[With reference to the statement, At the second hair cutting, he presents a bird as a sin offering and an animal as a burnt offering. At the third he presents a bird as a sin offering and an animal as a burnt offering,] at the second and at the third hair cutting, a pair of birds is unnecessary, for these were already offered [at the first one].*
- J. *What consideration is in play?*
- K. *Maybe he was confirmed with the skin ailment [and has to bring the sacrifices owing at the end of his uncleanness, Lev. 14:9], and on that account, he presents one of the birds as a sin offering [at the end of the second and third hair cuttings] for the doubt on account of the spell of days [Klien: the seven days that must be counted between the two pollings of a Nazirite but which have here become a whole period], and one for doubt on account of uncleanness [the burnt offering is presented on each occasion in case he has completed his Naziriteship in purity].*
- L. At the fourth he presents the sacrifice [marking the conclusion of the Naziriteship] in a condition of cleanness *and he stipulates as follows [60B]:* “If he is certainly a Nazirite [who had not contracted corpse uncleanness] [and had never been confirmed as afflicted with the skin ailment either], the first burnt offering fulfills an obligation, and this one is a free will offering, and if he had contracted uncleanness and was confirmed as afflicted with the skin ailment, the first burnt offering is a free will offering and this one is obligatory, and the other animals form the remainder of his offering.

**I.2 A. A Nazirite who was in doubt as to whether or not he was unclean but certainly certified as suffering from the skin ailment eats Holy Things after eight days [Klien: since the shaving for the skin ailment may take place immediately when he is seen to be clean and has still to wait eight days], and he may drink wine and contract corpse uncleanness after sixty-seven days. [Klien: For he must wait thirty days after the second haircut for the skin ailment before he may shave on account of doubt whether he was defiled, and then he counts thirty days for his Naziriteship in purity.]**

- B. **If he was subject to doubt as to whether he was certified with the skin ailment but had certainly contracted corpse uncleanness, he eats Holy Things after thirty-seven days [Klien: as a defiled Nazirite, he cuts the hair on becoming clean at the end of seven days and then again for his clean Naziriteship after thirty days. Since he may have been afflicted with the skin ailment, the two hair cuttings count for the skin ailment, and as he was certainly unclean, he can cut his hair after seven days for the uncleanness and again after thirty days for his clean Naziriteship], and may drink wine and contract corpse uncleanness after seventy-four days.**
- C. **If he was certainly unclean and certainly certified as afflicted with the skin ailment, he may eat Holy Things after eighty days and he drinks wine and**

contracts corpse-uncleanness after forty four days [Klien: seven for the skin ailment, seven for the defilement, and thirty for his clean Naziriteship] [T. 6:1ZZ-GGG].

- 1.3 A. [Following Tosefta's version:] His disciples asked R. Simeon bar Yohai, "As to a Nazirite who had not contracted corpse uncleanness but was afflicted with the skin ailment, what is the law as to his cutting hair one time only and counting that to meet his obligations for the one and for the other?"
- B. He said to them, "He does not cut his hair [one time for both purposes of purification]."
- C. They said to him, "Why not?"
- D. He said to them, "Now if this one were cutting his hair merely to grown and then remove the hair and that one were cutting his hair merely to grow and then remove the hair, you would have ruled quite well.
- E. "But the Nazir cuts his hair to remove the hair, and the *mesora*' cuts his hair in order thereafter to grow hair."
- F. They said to him, "But we too state the rule only so that it should not count for him for the days of the certification of his uncleanness. But let it [the single hair-cutting] count for him toward the days of his counting."
- G. He said to them, "If this one cut his hair after entering water, and that one cut his hair after entering water, you should have ruled quite well.
- H. "But while a Nazir cuts his hair after entering water, a *mesora*' cuts his hair before entering water."
- I. They said to him, "But we too do not state the rule so that the haircutting should go to his credit in a state of uncleanness. But let it go to his credit if he brings his offerings on account of uncleanness."
- J. He said to them, "If this one cut his hair after the tossing of blood, and that one cut his hair after the tossing of blood, you should have ruled quite well.
- K. "But a Nazir cuts his hair after the tossing of blood, while a *mesora*' cuts his hair before the tossing of blood."
- L. They said to him, "The correct view of the matter: Let it not go to his credit in the days of the completion of his certification for uncleanness, but let it go to his credit for the days of counting.
- M. "Let it not go to his credit in a case of cleanness, but let it go to his credit in a case of uncleanness:
- N. "A Nazir who was afflicted by *sara'at* and a *mesora*' who took a vow as a Nazir will then cut the hair one time for both requirements" [T. 5:2].
- O. [61A] R. Hiyya taught as a Tannaite statement, "The person afflicted with the skin offering cuts hair before immersion, the Nazirite who has contracted corpse uncleanness does so after immersion; the one before the sprinkling of the blood, the other afterward."

**II.1 A. ]** [the prohibition against] cutting the hair of the Nazirite [only] when [the *sara'at*] is certain. But in a case when it is subject to doubt, it does not override [the other]:

- B. *R. Ami bar Hama raised this question: "As to these four cuttings of the hair [Klien: for a Nazirite who was in doubt as to whether he was afflicted with the skin ailment and also as to whether he had contracted corpse uncleanness], are these required as a matter of religious duty or are they in order to remove the hair that has contracted uncleanness?"*
- C. *What difference does it make?*
- D. *Whether or not the hair may be removed by a depilatory. If you say that it is by reason of performing a religious duty, then it may not be removed by a depilatory, but if you say it is in order to remove the unclean hair, then it may be removed even by a depilatory ointment also. So what is the rule?*
- E. *Said Raba, "Come and take note: And he cuts the hair four times. Now if you should suppose that it is on account of removing unclean hair, then even if he cut it three times, also, it would have sufficed for him. [Klien: for only the first three cuttings are because of the skin ailment that is subject to doubt and the possibility that he has contracted corpse uncleanness. Since the law makes no distinction among them, they must all be equally be a religious duty]. So that bears the implication that it is by reason of performing a religious duty."*
- F. *It indeed bears that inference.*