

VII.

BAVLI TRACTATE NAZIR CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 47A-57A

7:1

- A. A high priest and a Nazirite do not contract corpse uncleanness on account of [burying even] their close relatives.
- B. [But they do contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse].
- C. If they together were going along the way and found a neglected corpse —
- D. R. Eliezer says, “Let a high priest contract corpse uncleanness, but let a Nazirite not contract corpse uncleanness.”
- E. And sages say, “Let a Nazirite contract corpse uncleanness, but let a high priest not contract corpse uncleanness.”
- F. Said to them R. Eliezer, “Let a priest contract corpse uncleanness, for he does not have to bring an offering on account of his uncleanness. But let a Nazirite not contract corpse uncleanness, for he does have to bring an offering on account of his uncleanness.”
- G. They said to him, “Let a Nazirite contract corpse uncleanness, for his sanctification is not a permanent sanctification, but let a priest not contract corpse uncleanness, for his sanctification is a permanent sanctification.”
- I.1** A. [A high priest and a Nazirite do not contract corpse uncleanness on account of burying even their close relatives. But they do contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse:]. *Now there is no problem understanding the positions of the respective parties as to a high priest and a Nazirite. The one party [sages] take the view that the high priest is at a higher level of sanctification, and the other party takes the view that the Nazirite is at a higher level of sanctification.*
- B. As between a high priest anointed with anointing oil [47B] and one that is qualified by investment with the garments of the high priest, the one who is anointed with anointing oil is at a higher level of sanctification, for while the high priest anointed with anointing oil must present a bullock for the violation of any of the religious duties, the one who is qualified by investiture does not do so.

- C. As between a high priest anointed with anointing oil who has been superseded [having substituted in carrying out the rites of the Day of Atonement for a high priest who was temporarily disqualified and having now stood down by reason of the return of the disqualified high priest to office] and one who was consecrated by investiture in additional priestly garments [and who is an established high priest], the one qualified by investiture in many garments is at a higher level of sanctification, for he performs the Temple rite while the superseded high priest who has been consecrated with anointing oil does not perform the Temple rite. [Klien: having officiated as high priest, he was not allowed to act as a common priest, nor could he officiate as high priest while the other lived.]
- D. A high priest who was superseded by reason of a nocturnal emission [Lev. 15:16] and one superseded by reason of the advent of a blemish [Lev. 21:17] — the one who was superseded by reason of a nocturnal emission is at a higher level of sanctification, *because he is suitable to serve as officiating priest the next day, while the one superseded by reason of the advent of a blemish is not going to be suitable to serve as officiating priest the next day.*

I.2 A. *The question was raised:* In matters of uncleanness, with respect to the prefect of the priests and the priest anointed for battle, *which of them takes precedence? The priest anointed for battle takes precedence, for he is suitable for making war, or perhaps the prefect of the priests takes precedence, because he is suitable for he is suitable for conducting the sacrificial rite?*

- B. *Come and take note of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:* There is no difference between the priest anointed for war and the prefect except that if the prefect of the priests and the priest anointed for war were going along the way and came across a neglected corpse — it is better that the anointed for war contract uncleanness in burying the corpse, but let the prefect of the priests not do so, [Bavli Horayot 13A: since if the high priest should be invalidated for service, the prefect of the priests will go and serve in his place.]
- C. *But it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* The priest anointed for battle priests takes precedence over prefect of the priests?
- D. *Said Mar Zutra, “When it comes to saving his life, the priest anointed for war takes precedence. How come? Because the public depends on him. And when it comes to contracting corpse uncleanness, the prefect takes precedence, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Hanina b. Antigonus says, ‘Why did they found the position of prefect to the high priest? So that if the high priest had a nocturnal emission that disqualified him to conduct the rites on the Day of Atonement, lo, the prefect may go and serve in his stead.’”*

II.1 A. **[If they together were going along the way and found a neglected corpse — R. Eliezer says, “Let a high priest contract corpse uncleanness, but let a Nazirite not contract corpse uncleanness.” And sages say, “Let a Nazirite contract corpse uncleanness, but let a high priest not contract corpse uncleanness:”]** *[Eliezer and sages] differ only concerning the high priest with a Nazirite walking together, but if they were going along one by one, each on his own, then both of them are subject to contracting corpse uncleanness to bury a neglected corpse.*

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for that rule?*

- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “Neither shall he go in to any corpse” (Lev. 21:11) — to what case does Scripture make reference?
- E. Could it be to strangers? But that rule derives from an argument a fortiori: if an ordinary priest, who does contract corpse uncleanness to tend to relatives, may not contract corpse uncleanness to bury strangers, a high priest, who does not contract corpse uncleanness even for relatives, surely should not contract corpse uncleanness to bury strangers.
- F. That yields the following inference: Scripture speaks of relatives. It is on account of his father that he does not contract corpse uncleanness, but he does contract corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse.
- G. **[48A]** “Nor for his mother” (Lev. 21:11) [a superfluous clause] — *that serves as the basis for a verbal analogy in accord with the position of Rabbi, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. Rabbi says, “With reference to the Nazirite, ‘when they die’ (Num. 6:7, meaning, the Nazirite’s relatives), he does not contract corpse uncleanness, but he does contract uncleanness on account of their plagues or their flux. I know that this rule applies only to the Nazirite. How do we know that it applies to the high priest? Say: Scripture does not have to make reference to ‘his mother’ in the setting of the high priest, for there is no need for Scripture to do so, for lo, it is an argument a fortiori, namely: if in a situation in which an ordinary priest does contract corpse uncleanness, e.g., his brothers on his father’s side, the high priest does not contract corpse uncleanness on account of his father [a nearer relation than the brother], in a situation in which an ordinary priest does not contract corpse uncleanness, namely, his brothers on his mother’s side, surely the high priest should not contract corpse uncleanness on account of his mother [a closer relative]. Now, if you have accomplished the proof on the foundation on logic, why is it necessary for Scripture to make reference to ‘his mother’ in the setting of the high priest? The clause is left otherwise unutilized and so may serve as the basis for a verbal analogy to yield an argument based on verbal analogy, specifically: reference is made to ‘his mother’ in the case of the Nazirite, and reference is made to ‘his mother’ in the case of the high priest. Just as ‘his mother’ stated with reference to the Nazirite means, it is when they are dead that he does not contract uncleanness from them, but he may contract uncleanness on account of their plagues and flux, so in the case of ‘his mother’ stated with regard to the high priest, it is when she is deceased that he does not contract corpse uncleanness on her account, but he may contract uncleanness by reason of her plagues and her flux.”
- I. *So we have found that a high priest contracts corpse uncleanness to bury a neglected corpse, how on the basis of Scripture do we know that that is the case for the Nazirite?*
- J. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. **“All the days that he separates himself to the Lord he shall not come near the soul of a dead body” (Num. 6: 6) —**
- L. Should I then infer that even to the soul of a beast is encompassed, in line with the usage, “‘He that smites the soul of a beast” (Lev. 24:18)?

- M. Scripture states, “near the soul of a dead body” — it concerns the soul of a human being that Scripture speaks.
- N. R. Ishmael says, “That proof is redundant. Lo, Scripture says, ‘He shall not come,’ thus referring to bodies that impart corpse uncleanness merely on ‘coming’ [under the same tent, as at Num. 19].”
- O. “For his father or for his mother” (Num. 6: 7) — for his father and for his mother he does not contract corpse uncleanness, but he does contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse” [Sifré to Numbers XXVI.II.1].
- P. [Building on the foregoing:] Now even if Scripture had not made that point [that for such as these he may not contract corpse uncleanness, but he must contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse], I could have proved it on the basis of logic. [Sif. Num. adds:] Now the high priest is subject to the prohibition against contracting corpse uncleanness even for relatives, and the Nazirite is subject to that same prohibition. If then I know as fact that the high priest nonetheless must contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse, then so too should the Nazirite contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse.]
- Q. There is, moreover an argument *a fortiori* :
- R. Now if a high priest, the sanctification of whom is permanent contracts corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse, the Nazirite, whose sanctification is only temporary, surely should contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse.
- S. No, [there is a difference between the two cases,] for if you invoke that rule in the case of a high priest, who does not have to bring an offering on account of contracting uncleanness, and therefore contracts corpse uncleanness in the case of a neglected corpse, will you say the same of the Nazirite, who does have to bring an offering if he contracts uncleanness, and, therefore, he, but not the other, should not contract corpse uncleanness?
- T. Accordingly, Scripture is needed to make the point:
- U. “Neither for his father nor for his mother, nor for brother or sister, if they die, shall he make himself unclean.”
- V. For such as these he may not contract corpse uncleanness, but he must contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse [which under all circumstances he must bury, there being no alternative for the task].
- W. May one argue a different view, namely:
- X. “Neither for his father nor for his mother, nor for brother or sister, if they die, shall he make himself unclean:” -- thus for his father and his mother he may not contract corpse uncleanness, but he *may* contract corpse uncleanness on account of any other corpses.
- Y. To prove the contrary you may construct an argument *a fortiori* as follows:
- Z. If an ordinary priest, who may contract corpse uncleanness to bury his relatives, may not contract corpse uncleanness on account of any other corpses, a Nazirite, who may not contract corpse uncleanness to bury his relatives, surely should not contract corpse uncleanness to bury anyone else.

- AA. **[48B] Lo, what then is the sense of the verse, “Neither for his father nor for his mother, nor for brother or sister, if they die, shall he make himself unclean”?**
- BB. **For such as these he may not contract corpse uncleanness, but he must contract corpse uncleanness on account of a neglected corpse.**
- CC. **Lo, even if the matter had not been made explicit, I still could have reached that conclusion on the basis of logic, as follows:**
- DD. **A general principle is stated with reference to a high priest, and the equivalent encompassing principle covers the Nazirite. Just as in the case of the high priest, the principle is that he may not contract corpse uncleanness on account of the need to bury relatives, so in the case of the Nazirite, he may not contract corpse uncleanness to bury relatives.**
- EE. But why argue from the analogy of the high priest? I shall draw an analogy to an ordinary priest. Specifically: an encompassing principle applies to an ordinary priest, and the same applies to a Nazirite: Just as in the former case, lo, the ordinary priest does contract corpse uncleanness to bury relatives, so in the case of the Nazirite, lo, he should contract corpse uncleanness to bury relatives.
- FF. **Or take this route: You draw the analogy from the case of the high priest, and I draw the analogy from the priest of the ordinary priest.**
- GG. **Accordingly, Scripture is required to make the matter clear:**
- HH. **“Neither for his father nor for his mother, nor for brother or sister, if they die, shall he make himself unclean:”**
- II. **He may not contract uncleanness on their account if they should die [Sifré to Numbers XXVI.II.2ff.]**
- JJ. *But surely that is required to make the point that he is not to contract corpse uncleanness on account of his father [and not to prove that he contracts corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse]?!*
- KK. “For his father” means, he is not to contract corpse uncleanness to bury his father [all the more so for his brother, the father being closer], “for his brother” yields, he may not contract corpse uncleanness for his brother, but he may contract corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse.
- LL. “or for his mother” is used to establish a verbal analogy in accord with the view of Rabbi.
- MM. “For his sister” (Num. 6: 7) *is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- NN. “For his sister” — why does Scripture include that clause?
- OO. Lo, if a Nazirite was en route to slaughter his Passover offering or to circumcise his son and he heard that he had suffered a bereavement, is it possible that he should contract corpse uncleanness on that account? Scripture says, “He shall not contract corpse uncleanness.”
- PP. Might one suppose that he should not contract corpse uncleanness to bury a neglected corpse?
- QQ. Scripture says, “For his sister,” meaning, for his sister he is not to contract corpse uncleanness, but for a neglected corpse he does.

- II.2** A. R. Aqiba says, “ ‘All the days that he separates himself to the Lord he shall not come near the soul of a dead body’ (Num. 6: 6) — ‘soul’ refers to strangers; ‘dead’ refers to relatives; ‘his father and his mother’ for his father and his mother he does not contract corpse uncleanness, but he does contract corpse uncleanness for his brothers. For if he is both high priest and a Nazirite, for his brother he does not contract corpse uncleanness, but he contracts corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse.”
- B. “And for his sister” — *that is in accord with what has been taught on Tannaite authority*: Lo, if a Nazirite was en route to slaughter his Passover offering or to circumcise his son and he heard that he had suffered a bereavement, is it possible that he should contract corpse uncleanness on that account? Scripture says, “He shall not contract corpse uncleanness.”
- C. Might one suppose that he should not contract corpse uncleanness to bury a neglected corpse?
- D. Scripture says, “For his sister,” meaning, for his sister he is not to contract corpse uncleanness, but for a neglected corpse he does.
- E. *Now as to R. Aqiba, how does he derive the argument based on verbal analogy produced by Rabbi?*
- F. He will say to you, “Since the master has said, ‘For if he is both high priest and a Nazirite, for his brother he does not contract corpse uncleanness, but he contracts corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse,’ *what difference does it make to me whether he is a high priest only, or both a high priest and a Nazirite* [Klien: in either case he is not forbidden to touch them if they have the skin ailment or flux]?”
- G. *Now as to R. Ishmael, how does he derive the rule governing a high priest who is also a Nazirite? [He too is obligated to bury a neglected corpse.] Since the All-Merciful has permitted him to violate a negative commandment in connection with a neglected corpse [contracting corpse uncleanness to bury him, even though he is a Nazirite or a high priest], what difference does it make to me whether it is a single negative commandment or two negative comments.*
- H. *What need then do I have for “for his sister”?*
- I. *It might have entered your mind to suppose that, when the All-Merciful permitted the Nazirite and the priest to contract corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse, that is because that represents the violation of a negative prohibition, but when it comes to circumcision and the Passover offering, which involve extirpation, he should not contract corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse. So we are informed to the contrary.*
- J. **[49A]** *Now from the perspective of R. Aqiba, since there is no difference, from his perspective, between the case of a man who is solely a high priest and who is both a high priest and a Nazirite, [in both cases, the man contracts corpse uncleanness for a neglected corpse], what need do I have for the clause, “for his father and for his mother”?*

- L. *Both are required, for if Scripture had made reference only to “his father,” I might have supposed that this is the particular reason that he is not to contract corpse uncleanness on the father’s account, because it is simply an accepted assumption that he is really the father, while in the case of the mother, in which instance we know for certain that she has given birth to him, he should contract uncleanness for her [and hence it was necessary to make reference to the mother as well. And if Scripture had made reference only to “his mother,” I might have supposed that it is for his mother in particular that he is not to contract corpse uncleanness, for her children’s descent does not derive from her [but through the male line], but as to his father, since concerning whom the master has said, “by their families, by their father’s houses’ (Num. 1: 2), [so descent is through the male line], I might have said that he should contract corpse uncleanness on the father’s account. So we are informed that that is not the case.*
- M. **[49A]** *[Now from the perspective of R. Aqiba,] “Nor shall he go in to any dead body” (Lev. 21:11) [in reference to the high priest] — “any” serves to exclude strangers, “dead” excludes relatives, “body” [souls] excludes the case of a quarter log of blood that derives from two corpses, which imparts corpse uncleanness in the tent of a corpse, in line with the verse, “Nor shall he go in to any dead body” (Lev. 21:11).*

7:2

- A. **On account of what sorts of uncleanness does the Nazirite cut his hair [and bring an offering for having become unclean]?**
- B. **On account of a corpse, and on account of an olive’s bulk of flesh from a corpse, and on account of an olive’s bulk of corpse-matter, and on account of a ladleful of corpse mould;**
- C. **on account of the backbone, and on account of the skull, and on account of a limb of a corpse, and on account of a limb cut from a living human being on which is still proper flesh;**
- D. **and on account of a half-qab of bones, and on account of a half-log of blood —**
- E. **on account of touching them, and on account of carrying them, and on account of overshadowing them;**
- F. **and on account of a bone the bulk of a barley seed —**
- G. **on account of touching it and on account of carrying it.**
- H. **on account of the backbone, and on account of the skull.**
- I. **On account of these the Nazirite must cut his hair and be sprinkled on the third and seventh days. And he loses the days that he has already observed.**
- J. **And he begins to count [clean days] only after he is made clean and brings his offerings.**

I.1 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. After R. Meir's death, R. Judah said to his disciples, "Don't let the disciples of R. Meir come in here, because they are contentious and come not to study the Torah but to throw up against me a barrage of [trivial] laws."
- C. Nonetheless Sumkhos forced his way in. He said to them, "This is what R. Meir repeated to me [as a Mishnah teacher]: **On account of what sorts of uncleanness does the Nazirite cut his hair [and bring an offering for having become unclean]? On account of a corpse, and on account of an olive's bulk of flesh from a corpse.**"
- D. R. Judah became angry with them and said to them, "Didn't I tell you, 'Don't let the disciples of R. Meir in here, because they are contentious and come not to study the Torah but to throw up against me a barrage of [trivial] laws'? If a Nazirite has to get a haircut if he contracts corpse uncleanness from an olive's bulk of the flesh of a corpse, should he not all the more so have to cut his hair for contracting corpse uncleanness from the corpse itself! [Why say self-evident things?]"
- E. **[50A]** Said R. Yosé, "Should people say, 'Meir lies in his grave, Judah is outraged, and Yosé kept his silence'? Then what will come of the teachings of the Torah?"
- F. Said R. Yosé, "It was necessary to teach that detail only to deal with the case of a corpse that does not have on it an olive's bulk of flesh."
- G. Still, people could say, "On account of a limb from the corpse the Nazirite has to cut his hair, on the whole of it surely he will have to do the same!"
- H. *Rather, it is in accord with what R. Yohanan said, "It was necessary to make that statement only to deal with the case of an abortion, the limbs of which were not bound together by sinews, and here too, what is at issue is an abortion, the limbs of which are not bound together by sinews."* [Klien: a single limb of such an abortion containing an olive's bulk of flesh would not convey defilement, but the whole does.]
- I. Raba said, "It was necessary to make that statement only with reference to a case in which the greater part of the body-structure and the greater number of the bones do not add up to a quarter-qab of bones."

II.1 A. ...and on account of an olive's bulk of corpse-matter:

- B. What is the definition of corpse-matter?
- C. It is the flesh of a corpse that has coagulated, or a liquid secretion from a corpse that was heated and has congealed.
- D. *What circumstances are contemplated by this ruling? If we should say that we don't know that it belongs to the corpse, then even if it has coagulated, what difference does it make? So it must be a case in which we know that it derives from the corpse, but in that case, even though it has not coagulated, [it is still a source of corpse-uncleanness]!*
- E. Said R. Jeremiah, "We deal with a case in which the secretion is not clearly identified as to origin. If it has coagulated, then it is a secretion of a corpse, otherwise, it may be phlegm or mucus."

II.2 A. *Abbaye asked Rabbah, "Does the category of corpse-dregs pertain also to the uncleanness brought about by the corpses of animals, or is that not the case? Do we rule that we have learned a tradition concerning corpse-*

dregs that derive from man, but none concerning corpse-dregs that derive from a beast? Or perhaps there is no difference?"

- B. *That poses no problem to the authority who has said, Bar Peda, who has said, "Principal uncleanness [e.g., that conveyed to one who carries the substance] applies to it so long as it can be eaten by a proselyte, but secondary uncleanness [which is conveyed to one who merely touches it] pertains so long as it can be eaten by a dog." [Corpse dregs cannot be eaten by a human being.] But in line with the position of him who has said, "Uncleanness in both forms pertains so long as it is fit for a dog to eat," what is to be said?*
- C. *Come and take note: If one melted unclean fat with fire, it remains unclean, but if it melted in the sun [when it becomes corpse-dregs], it becomes insusceptible to uncleanness. Now if you should imagine that secondary uncleanness [which is conveyed to one who merely touches it] pertains so long as it can be eaten by a dog, then even if it melted in the sun, too, it should remain unclean!*
- D. *When does it melt in the sun? Only after it has decomposed. And once it has decomposed, it is nothing more than dirt.*
- E. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **Any unbroken stream of water is clean, except for thick honey and porridge. [50B] The House of Shammai say, "Also: one of porridge made from grits or beans, because it shrinks backwards" [M. Makh. 5:9A-D].** [Klien: being thick liquids they have such elasticity that when he ceases to pour out the liquid, the lower end of the jet that has touched the unclean vessel springs back into the upper vessel.]*
- F. *R. Ammi bar Hama raised this question: "Does the principle that uncleanness is transferred through a jet apply to the case of foodstuffs [solid food that is melted, e.g., fat poured from a clean to an unclean utensil]? Do we say that that principle applies to thick honey and batter since they contain discharge, while food contains none, or is the operative consideration that they form compact masses, and the food also forms compact masses? [What causes the jet stream to shrink backwards? Is it a trait of honey etc., which does not pertain to food, and food would not then transfer uncleanness from the lower to the upper end of the jet? Or does it have that capacity, in the same way as any solid becomes wholly unclean even though part of it is unclean (Klien)?]*
- G. *Said Raba, "Come and take note: **In the case of a whole piece of fat from a corpse which one melted, it remains unclean. If it was in bits and pieces and one melted them together, the mixture remains clean [T. Ahilot 2:2].** Now, if it should enter your mind that the principle that uncleanness is transferred through a jet does not apply to the case of foodstuffs, then in the case of a whole piece*

of human fat that one melted down, it too should be deemed insusceptible to uncleanness once melted [Klien: while being melted, the fat would move from side to side of the utensil, so there would be less than an olive's bulk of fat in one spot, if the jet of liquid fat is not counted as joined together].

H. *Said R. Zira, "I and Mar b. Rabina explained this teaching as follows: In this situation with what sort of a case do we deal? For instance, while he is melting masses, a column of fire went up to the mouth of the utensil [the utensil was not moving, so the fat was heated all together], and the fat thus coagulated while it was all together"* [Klien: without moving from its original position; there was then no flow.]

I. *Said R. Abina to R. Ashi, "Come and take note: The House of Shammai say, 'Also: one of porridge made from grits or beans, because it shrinks backwards' [M. Makh. 5:9A-D]."* [Rabbis are assumed to disagree with the House of Shammai only with regard to grist and beans but they accept his criterion of springing back; this occurs only with liquid (Klien).]

J. *So what! There [in the case of the thick honey and batter, it is because they are compact, here it is because of the discharge. [They disagree as to the criterion. The House of Shammai say it is the consideration of the discharge, the rabbis, the consideration of compact mass (Klien).]*

III.1 A. and on account of a ladleful of corpse mould:

B. What is the requisite volume?

C. Hezekiah said, "The palm of the hand [full]."

D. R. Yohanan said, "The hollow of the hand [full]."

E. *We have learned in the Mishnah: "The measure of the ladleful corpse mold of which sages spoke is, from the bottom of the fingers upwards," the words of R. Meir.*

F. And sages say, "The hollow of the hand [full]" [T. **Ahilot 2:2**].

G. *Now there is no problem for R. Yohanan, for he has ruled in accord with the position of rabbis. But in accord with what Tannaite authority has Hezekiah made his decision, for it can be in accord neither with R. Meir nor with rabbis!*

H. *Say, "The palm of the hand [full]" is the same volume as "from the bottom of the fingers upwards."*

- I. *Said R. Simi bar Ada to R. Pappa, "How do we know that 'from the joints of the fingers upwards' means, to the very tips? Maybe it means, lower down the hand, when the measure is the palm of the handful [and Hezekiah concurs]?"*
- J. (Delete:) That question stands.

Topical Composite on Corpse-Mould

III.2 A. [51A] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **And what is the [sort of] corpse that produces corpse-mould? That which is buried naked, in a stone sarcophagus, on a marble floor or table — that is a corpse that produces corpse-mould. But that which is buried in its shroud, in a wooden coffin, on dirt — that is a corpse that does not produce corpse-mould [T. Ahilot 2:3A-C].**

III.3 A. Said Ulla, "Corpse-mould is only that which derives from flesh, sinews, or bones."

- B. *Raba objected to Ulla, "[A Tannaite rule:] Corpse-mould that derives from flesh is clean. Lo, that which derives from bone is unclean, and that is the case even though there is no flesh."*
- C. *"Say the rule in the following formulation: Corpse-mould that derives from flesh is clean, unless there is a bone in the flesh."*
- D. But lo, there are no sinews!
- E. It is not possible for there to be flesh and bones without sinews.

III.4 A. Said R. Shemen bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "Two corpses that one buried with one another — the one acts as a covering for the other [so that the corpse-mould that is produced will not impart corpse-uncleanness, as though the corpse were buried with a shroud (Klien)]."

- B. *Objected R. Nathan b. R. Oshaia, "Corpse mould that derives from two corpses is unclean."*
- C. Said Raba, "That is the case when they buried this one by itself and that one by itself, and they moldered and together formed a ladleful of corpse-mould." [Klien: in such a case the joint mixture causes uncleanness, but if buried together the two corpses produce mould that does not impart uncleanness.]

III.5 A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hanna said R. Yohanan, "If one cut off the corpse's hair and buried the hair with the corpse, it serves as a shroud [and the mould that results does not impart uncleanness]."

III.6 A. *There we have learned: All things that belong to the corpse are unclean except for the teeth, hair, and nails. While these are attached to the corpse, all of them are unclean as well [M. Oh. 3:3].*

- B. *Hezekiah raised this question: "As to the hair that is long enough to be cut, the nails long enough to be pared [and would have been cut or pared had the man not died], what is the rule? Do we invoke the principle, Whatever is of sufficient length to be cut is regarded as though it had been cut? Or perhaps, in the present moment, at any rate, they are attached to the corpse and reckoned with it?"*

- C. *We may work out the answer from what Rabbah bar bar Hannah said, “The governing consideration that the hair acts as a shroud is that he has cut it, but lo, if he had not cut it, it does not [so the attached hair is part of the corpse, pure and simple].”*
- D. *This is the sense of the question: if he cut it off, it serves as a shroud would, but if he did not cut it off, then the question as to its effect is raised [just as Hezekiah has said].*

III.7 A. R. Jeremiah raised this question: “As to corpse-matter that derives from the lower part of the body [text: the heel], what is the law? *Where we have learned a tradition concerning corpse mould, it is that which comes from the whole of the corpse, but that which comes only from the lower part of the body does not qualify, or perhaps there is no difference?*”

- B. *Come and take note: R. Nathan b. R. Oshaia taught as a Tannaite statement: “Corpse mould that comes from two corpses [so forming the requisite volume of corpse-matter only through the contributions of two separate corpses] is unclean.” Now if it should enter your mind that that which comes only from the lower part of the body does not qualify, then go and take one corpse, and if the mould may have been taken from the lower body, and if in the other, it may have been taken from the lower body, the mixture should not contaminate [and that contradicts the cited rule]!*
- C. *If the entire corpse has decayed, and the mould comes from the lower part of the body, that too would contaminate. But here we deal with a case in which one limb has decayed, and the mould has been taken from the lower part of the body. What would be the rule here?*
- D. *That question stands.*

III.8 A. R. Jeremiah raised this question: “Does the fetus in the woman’s womb function as a shroud or is that not the case? [That is, would the decayed matter of the fetus be treated as if it were wood or cloth and not constitute corpse mould?] Since the master has said, ‘The fetus is tantamount to the mother’s thigh,’ therefore it is part of her body and could not constitute the equivalent of a shroud when it comes to corpse-matter, or perhaps, since it is destined to come forth, it is treated as distinct from her body?”

- B. **[51B]** “Semen in the womb of a woman — what is the law? Do we say, since it has not yet taken shape as an embryo, it is regarded as part of her body [and does not form the counterpart to a shroud when it comes to the matter of corpse mould], or perhaps, since it has come from an outside source, it is not part of the body [and therefore does]?”

III.9 A. R. Pappa raised the question, “What is the law as to shit? Since it cannot last without food, it is part of the living body [and not tantamount to a shroud so far as corpse-matter is concerned], or perhaps this too has come from an outside source?”

- B. *R. Aha b. R. Iqa raised the question, “What is the law as to the deceased’s skin [better: spit]?”*
- C. *R. Huna bar Manoah raised the question, “What about his phlegm and his mucus?”*

- D. *Said R. Samuel bar Aha to R. Pappa, "Now if it should enter your mind that all of these items constitute the equivalent of shrouds so far as corpse mould is concerned, then how can there ever be a case of corpse-mould that imparts uncleanness?"*
- E. *"If he was given water from the well of palm trees [a laxative], had hair removed with a depilatory, and was boiled in the hot springs of Tiberias [to remove the skin]."*

III.10 A. *Said Abbaye, "We hold as a tradition: a corpse that has been ground up to powder does not produce corpse mould."*

- B. *The question was raised: If it was ground up to powder, and then it decayed, what is the law? If the governing consideration that corpse-mould imparts corpse uncleanness only because of the flesh, bones, and sinews that are present, and here they are present, or do we want the corpse-mould in its original form, and this we do not have?*
- C. *That question stands.*

III.11 A. *Ulla bar Hanina set forth as a Tannaite rule: "A corpse that is lacking a limb does not produce corpse mould, nor does it acquire the ground on which it rests, nor does it turn the area into a grave area."*

- B. *An objection was raised: He said to them, "No, if you have said so concerning the corpse, to which apply the terms 'greater part,' 'quarter,' and 'corpse mould,' will you say so concerning the living being, to which do not apply the terms 'greater part,' 'quarter,' and 'corpse mould'?" [M. Ed. 6:3T].*
- C. *Now what are the conditions of the case at hand [under which the law of corpse mould does not apply to a living body]? It is a case in which only one limb has decayed [that is, part of the body]. Along these same lines, in the case of a corpse, even if one member has decomposed, the law of corpse mould applies [vs. A]!*
- D. *Does the Tannaite formulation say, "while in the case of the corpse [the law of corpse mould does apply]"? Lo, we are informed that, while there are corpses to which the law of corpse mould applies [that is, the entire body], there are no living beings to whom the law of corpse mould applies.*

III.12 A. *Raba raised this question: "If a man's limb decayed while he was yet alive, and then he went and died, what is the law? Where we have a tradition concerning corpse mould, it pertains to a case when the man has died, or perhaps, now, in any case, he is dead!"*

- B. *Come and take note: "No, if you have said so concerning the corpse, to which apply the terms 'greater part,' 'quarter,' and 'corpse mould,' will you say so concerning the living being, to which do not apply the terms 'greater part,' 'quarter,' and 'corpse mould'?" [M. Ed. 6:3T]. So the operative consideration is that he is alive. Lo, if he were dead, he would be subject to the consideration of corpse-mould. [That answers Raba's question in the affirmative.]*
- C. *Does the Tannaite formulation say, "while in the case of the corpse [the law of corpse mould does apply]"? Lo, we are informed that, while there are corpses to which the law of corpse mould applies [that is, the entire body], there are no living beings to whom the law of corpse mould applies.*

III.13 A. *Raba raised this question, “An ant that is lacking parts — what is the law [as to whether one is flogged for eating such a creature]? It is a tradition that we have learned concerning the requisite volume of the ant that pertains for culpability to be incurred, and this we do not have in the present case, or perhaps the tradition is explicit that one is culpable for eating a distinct and separate creature, and that condition is met?”*

- B. **[52A]** *Said R. Judah of Disqarta, “Come and take note: “...in them...” (Lev. 11:31) — might I think that it must be by the whole of the body of the dead creeping thing? Scripture says, “...in them...,” [meaning, part of them, however small]. Might one think that that may be by any minute part of them? says, “...in them....” How so? It must be such that one touches part of the creature that is equivalent to the whole of it. Sages estimated that measure as the size of a lentil, for a snail [as a whole but tiny creature] to begin with is the size of a lentil.’ That leads to the inference: it is a tradition that we have learned concerning the requisite volume of the ant that pertains for culpability to be incurred.”*
- C. *Said R. Shemayah, “Where we require a particular volume, so that, if it is not the volume of a lentil, it does not impart uncleanness, that is where there is no life in it, but when there is life in it, then no minimum size may be required. That is the question before you.”*

IV.1 A. **On account of the backbone, and on account of the skull:**

- B. *The question was raised: Do we learn in the Mishnah-paragraph the formulation, the backbone and the skull, or perhaps it is, either the backbone or the skull?*
- C. *Said Raba, “Come and take note: **A backbone which has been stripped of the greater part of its vertebrae, even though its outline stands, is clean. When it is in the grave, even if it is broken, and even if it is crushed, it is unclean, because the grave joins it together [T. Ahilot 2:5A]. The skull which had in it a single long perforation, or in which were many perforations — they join together [to make up] the measure of the drill-hole [T. Ahilot 2:6A].** /The operative consideration is that it has been stripped. Lo, had it not been stripped, it would be unclean [on its own, without the skull]. That proves that the correct reading is **either the backbone or the skull.** The question was raised: Do we learn in the Mishnah-paragraph the formulation, the backbone and the skull, or perhaps it is, either the backbone or the skull?*
- C. *Said Raba, “Come and take note: **A backbone which has been stripped of the greater part of its vertebrae, even though its outline stands, is clean. When it is in the grave, even if it is broken, and even if it is crushed, it is unclean, because the grave joins it together [T. Ahilot 2:5A]. The skull which had in it a single long perforation, or in which were many perforations — they join together [to make up] the measure of the drill-hole [T. Ahilot 2:6A].** The operative consideration is that it has been stripped. Lo, had it not been stripped, it would be unclean [on its own, without the skull]. That proves that the correct reading is **either the backbone or the skull.**”*
- D. *Does the Tannaite formulation state, . **When it is in the grave, even if it is broken, and even if it is crushed, it is unclean, because the grave joins it***

together? *What it says is, when the backbone is stripped, it is clean; the other matter remains subject to question.*

- E. *Come and take note: Said R. Judah, “Six matters did R. Aqiba declare unclean, and he then reversed himself. A case: They brought buckets of bones from Kefar Tabya, and they left them in the open air at the synagogue of the Tarsians in Lud. Teodoros the physician came in, with all the physicians with him. They said, ‘There is not present a backbone from a single corpse, nor a skull from a single corpse.’ [T. continues: They said, ‘Since some present declare unclean and some present declare clean, let us arise for a vote.’ They began from R. Aqiba, and he declared [them] clean. They said to him, ‘Since you, who [in the past] declared unclean, have declared clean, let them be clean.’” Said R. Simeon, “And until the day of R. Aqiba’s death, he declared them unclean. Whether or not he reversed himself after he died I do not know” (T. **Ahilot 4: 2**)]. Now the operative consideration here is that, **There is not present a backbone from a single corpse. Lo, had there been either a backbone or a skull from a single corpse, a Nazirite would have had to cut his hair on account of contracting corpse uncleanness on that account. That proves that the operative language of the Mishnah-rule is, either the backbone or the skull***
- F. *Not at all. What we have is an argument in ascending severity: it is not a question that there is not a backbone and a skull from a single corpse, but there is not even a backbone from a single corpse or a skull from a single corpse!*
- G. *Come and take note of the evidence of the enumeration, **Six matters did R. Aqiba declare unclean.** And what are the six matters that R. Aqiba declares unclean and sages declare clean? A limb constructed by taking one bone from one corpse and another from a second corpse, a limb set up from bones cut from two living men, a half-qab of bones taken from two corpses, a quarter-log of blood taken from two corpses, a barley-seed’s bulk of bone broken into two parts, the backbone and the skull. **[52B]** Now if you maintain that the correct reading is, **either the backbone or the skull**, then the proper reading should be not six but seven!*
- H. *When the number six was specified, it pertained to all those cases in which the majority took issue with him, but it excluded the case of a barley seed’s bulk of bone, since only an individual took issue with him, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **A bone the size of a barleycorn which was divided into two [parts] — R. Aqiba declares unclean. And R. Yohanan b. Nuri declares clean [M. Oh. 2:7A-C].***
- I. *And if you prefer, I shall say: when the number six was mentioned, it pertained to limbs coming from a corpse, not to limbs coming from a living person.*
- J. *And if you prefer, I shall say: when the number six was mentioned, it pertained to any situation in which a Nazirite has to cut his hair by reason of contracting corpse uncleanness through overshadowing, thus excluding the case of a bone the size of a barley seed, in which that is not the rule.*
- K. *And if you prefer, I shall say: when the number six was mentioned, it pertained to all the cases in which R. Aqiba retracted his ruling, excluding the case of the quarter-log of blood, in which instance he did not retract.*

L. *For said Rabbi to Bar Qappara, “Do not repeat as the Mishnah-formulation of the retractions the matter of the quarter-log of blood, for lo, in that case R. Aqiba’s traditional learning was in his hand, and, furthermore, Scripture supports him: ‘Neither shall he go in to any dead body’ (Lev. 21:11).”*

M. **Said R. Simeon, “And until the day of R. Aqiba’s death, he declared them unclean. Whether or not he reversed himself after he died I do not know” (T. [Ahiot 4: 2](#))**

N. *A Tannaite statement: His teeth turned black because of his fasting [for such disrespectful language].*

O. *Come and take note of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: The House of Shammai say, “A quarter-qab of bones from the bones, whether from two or from three corpses.” And the House of Hillel say, “A quarter-qab of bones — from the body, from the greater part of the bone structure, or from the greater part of the number [of individual bones].” Shammai says, “Even from one bone” [M. [Ed. 1:7](#)]. Said R. Joshua, “I can reconcile the opinion of the House of Shammai and the opinion of the House of Hillel. For the House of Shammai say, ‘whether from two or from three corpses,’ meaning, either from two shoulders and one thigh, or from two thighs and one shoulder,’ since this would constitute the greater part of the bone structure. And the House of Hillel say, ‘from the body, from the greater part of the bone structure or from the greater part of the number of individual bones,’ meaning, this majority is to be found in the joints of the hands and feet.’ [Klien: the bones in the hands and feet form the greater number of bones in the body without being so important that they form the major part of the structure.] Shammai says, “Even from one bone, from the backbone or from the skull [produces uncleanness when overshadowed in line with the rule of Num. 19].” [The upshot is, the correct reading is either...or....]*

P. *Shammai is exceptional, because he imposes the more strict rule [even a single bone serves, so he does not require both the skull and backbone; rabbis differ (Klien)].*

Q. *May one then infer from this that the operative consideration of Shammai is, he takes the stricter view, while rabbis would require both the backbone and the skull?*

R. *Not at all. The point is, rabbis differ from Shammai only in the case of a single bone that comes from the backbone or the skull, but where they are complete, one alone suffices.*

IV.2 A. *R. Ammi bar Hama raised this question: “What is the rule in the case of a quarter-qab deriving from the backbone and the skull? When the Tannaite formulation spoke of a half-qab of bones, that would pertain to a case in which there were bones from other limbs too, but since the bones from the backbone and skull are subject to a more severe ruling, then even a quarter-qab would suffice? Or perhaps there is no difference?”*

B. *Said Raba, “Come and take note of the reading of the Mishnah-rule: **on account of the backbone, and on account of the skull.** Now, if it should enter your mind that a quarter-qab of bones coming from the backbone and skull are subject to a*

more severe ruling, then the formulation should be, on account of a quarter-qab of bones that come from the backbone, and on account of a quarter-qab of bones that come from skull [Klien: for this is less than a whole skull and includes it.]

- C. **[53A]** *But lo, Raba himself is the one who has said, “[A particular reference] is required only in the case of a backbone or skull that do not comprise a quarter-qab of bones” [Klien: and how can he infer from the mention of the backbone and skull that a quarter-qab of bones from the backbone and skull does not defile/?]*
- D. *After hearing what R. Aqiba said, he changed his view [Klien: and the reply to R. Ammi bar Hama was given before he heard it.]*
- E. *Come and take note: Shammai says, “Even from one bone, from the backbone or from the skull [produces uncleanness when overshadowed in line with the rule of Num. 19].”*
- F. *Shammai is exceptional, because he imposes the more strict rule.*
- G. *May one then infer from this that the operative consideration of Shammai [in accepting a single bone] is, he takes the stricter view, while rabbis would require a half-qab of bones.*
- H. *But perhaps rabbis differ from Shammai only in the case in which there is a single bone, but in a case in which there is a quarter-qab of bones, even rabbis will concur..*

IV.3 A. Said R. Eliezer, “The prior elders — some would say, ‘A half-qab of bones and a half log of blood is required for all purposes [thus imparting corpse uncleanness through overshadowing under all circumstances], a quarter-qab of bones and a quarter-log of blood does not suffice for all purposes. And some would say, ‘Even a quarter-qab of bones and a quarter-log of blood suffice for all purposes.’ The court that followed them [by way of compromise between these positions] said, ‘A half-qab of bones and a half-qab of blood suffice for all purposes, a quarter-qab of bones and quarter-log of blood suffice [for imparting uncleanness] to food in the status of heave offering and Holy Things, but not for [imparting corpse uncleanness to] a Nazirite or to the person who is going to prepare his Passover offering.’”

- B. *But the proposed compromise of the third party is no compromise at all [but rather takes part of each of the opinions of the prior authorities]!*
- C. *Said R. Jacob bar Idi, “They said the ruling on the bases of a received tradition, specifically, from Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.”*

V.1 A. **On account of these the Nazirite must cut his hair and be sprinkled on the third and seventh days:**

- B. **On account of these [and these alone] — in the first clause [at M. 7:2] excludes a bone the size of a barley seed,** on account of touching or carrying which one is unclean, but on account of overshadowing which, he is not.
- C. **And on account of these [and these alone] — in the following Mishnah-paragraph [M. 7:3],** excludes a rock that overhangs a grave [which conveys uncleanness when touched but not through overshadowing].

VI.1 A. **and on account of a half-qab of bones, and on account of a half-log of blood:**

B. [53B] Only on account of a half-qab of bones does the Nazirite cut his hair, but not on account of a quarter-qab — *under what circumstances? Should I say that among the bones are some a barley seed in size? Then we can give as the reason that the Nazirite must cut his hair the fact that there is a barley seed's bulk of bone!*

C. *It is a case in which the bone was crushed to powder.*

VII.1 A. and on account of a limb of a corpse, and on account of a limb cut from a living human being on which is still proper flesh:

B. If on the limbs there is not a proper amount of flesh, *what is the rule?*

C. R. Yohanan said, "The Nazirite does not have to cut his hair on account of it."

D. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "The Nazirite does have to cut his hair on account of it."

E. R. Yohanan said, "The Nazirite does not have to cut his hair on account of it: *for lo, the Tannaite formulation states to begin with, on account of a limb cut from a living human being on which is still proper flesh, with the implication, that on which is still proper flesh is subject to the rule, that on which is not proper flesh is not.*

F.] R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "The Nazirite does have to cut his hair on account of it." *for this is not encompassed in the next Mishnah-paragraph [where such cases are enumerated thus: But as to uncleanness contracted by overshadowing interlaced foliage, projecting stones, a grave area, foreign land, the sealing stone and the buttressing stone [of a grave], a quarter log of blood, and a tent, and a quarter qab of bones, and utensils that touch a corpse, and because of the days of counting after producing a symptom of sara'at (as at Lev. 14: 8) and the days during which he is certified unclean with sara'at — on account of these, the Nazirite does not cut his hair or sprinkle himself on the third and seventh days and he does not lose the prior days [observed in cleanness (M. Naz. 7: 3)].*

G. And R. Yohanan?

H. *He will say to you, "Whatever is to be inferred from the rule of our Mishnah is not then logged into the Mishnah-paragraph that follows."*

I. *But lo, there is the matter of a half-qab of bones, which bears the implication that if a Nazirite is affected by a half-qab of bones, he does have to cut his hair, but if by a quarter-qab of bones, he does not. And yet, in the following Mishnah-paragraph, it is stated, a quarter qab of bones, thus making explicit what is implicit in any event!*

J. *In that case, if there were not an explicit reference to a quarter-qab of bones, I might have thought that he does not have to get a haircut even if he contracted uncleanness through touching or carrying it, so the Mishnah-rule had to speak of the quarter-qab of bones to indicate that it is only for overshadowing the, but not for touching or carrying, that the Nazirite is not required to get a haircut.*

K. But lo, there is the matter of the half-log of blood that is mentioned in our Mishnah, which bears the implication that if a Nazirite is affected by a half-log of blood, he does have to cut his hair, but if by a quarter-log of blood, he does not. And yet in the following Mishnah-paragraph there is an

explicit reference to, **a quarter log of blood**, thus making explicit what is implicit in any event!

- L. *That explicit reference serves to exclude the position of R. Aqiba, for said R. Aqiba, “A quarter-lob of blood deriving from two corpses conveys uncleanness through overshadowing” [which view is rejected here by the explicit reference].*
- M. *As to this limb cut from a corpse — how are we to define it? Specifically, if it contains a bone the size of a barley seed, how can we account for the position of R. Yohanan [who says the Nazirite does not have to get a haircut if he touches it], and if it does not contain bone the volume of a barley seed, what is the reason for R. Simeon b. Laqish’s position that he does?*
- N. *R. Simeon b. Laqish will say to you, “In point of fact, it is one that does not contain bone the size of a barley seed, and even so, the All-merciful has extended the law to encompass it, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority.*
- O. “Whoever in the open field touches someone slain with a sword or one that dies on his own shall be unclean for seven days” (Num. 19:16) —
- P. “Whoever in the open field:” this refers to someone who overshadows a corpse.
- Q. “touches someone slain:” this speaks of a limb cut from a living person that is in such a condition that if attached to the body it could have been restored.
- R. “with a sword:” this indicates that that is of the same remove of uncleanness as the corpse itself.
- S. “or one that dies on his own:” this refers to a limb cut off of a corpse.
- T. “or a bone of a man:” this refers to a quarter-qab of bones.
- U. “or a grave:” this refers to a stopped up grave [where there is no empty space of a handbreadth between the corpse and the roof of the grave].
- V. **[54A]** For a master said, “Unclean breaks forth upward or breaks for downward [affecting anyone walking above or beneath such a grave through overshadowing].
- W. *[In addition to these modes of contracting uncleanness through overshadowing,] as regards contracting uncleanness through contact, said R. Judah, “It has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘And on him who touches the bone or the slain’ (Num. 19:18) — ‘the bone’ refers to a bone the size of a barley seed; ‘or the slain’ speaks of a limb cut from a living body that is not such that if attached to the body it could have been restored. ‘Or the dead’ refers to a limb cut from a corpse.”*
- X. “‘or the grave’ refers” — said R. Simeon b. Laqish — “to the graves of those buried before the revelation at Sinai.” [Israelites buried before the Torah’s revelation do not convey uncleanness by

overshadowing, but, like bodies of gentiles, they convey uncleanness if they are touched.”

X. *“Now with reference to the limb cut from the living person, how is it to be defined? If it has a bone the bulk of a barley seed, it is implicit in the rule, one who touches a bone! Therefore it must refer to a bone that does not add up to the volume of a barley seed, nonetheless, the All-Merciful has included it among the things that produce uncleanness when they are touched.”*

Y. R. Yohanan will say to you, “In point of fact it is a bone that contains a barley seed of bulk, and if the verse is not required to teach that such a bone imparts uncleanness when it is touched, you can use it to indicate that it imparts uncleanness through carrying [when not touched].” [Klien: and we cannot infer from this that a limb that has not a bone of a barley-grain’s bulk defiles a Nazirite who touches it.]

VIII.1 A. [On account of these the Nazirite must cut his hair and] be sprinkled on the third and seventh days. [And he loses the days that he has already observed. And he begins to count [clean days] only after he is made clean and brings his offerings]:

B. *The question was raised: When the Mishnah-rule states, **only after he is made clean**, does this refer to the seventh day? Meaning, until after the sun has set, and who is the authority? It would be R. Eliezer. Or perhaps it refers to the eighth day, and what is the meaning of, **only after he is made clean**? It is, after he will have presented his offerings, and who is the authority? It would be rabbis. [Reference is made to the following: “If the Nazirite contracted corpse uncleanness on the seventh day of purification, and then once more contracted corpse uncleanness on the seventh day following, he is liable to offer a single offering. If he contracts uncleanness on the eighth day and then again on the eighth day following, he is liable to offer an offering for each event. He begins to count the days toward the new Naziriteship immediately [even prior to offering the sacrifices],” the words of R. Eliezer. And sages say, “He is obligated to a single offering for all occasions of uncleanness, so long as he has not yet offering his sin-offering [Num. 6:10-12] [such as is required for a Nazirite who has contracted uncleanness]. If he has presented his sin-offering and then contracts uncleanness, and again presents his sin-offering and again contracts uncleanness, he is liable to present an offering for each episode of uncleanness. If he has presented his sin-offering but not his guilt offering, he starts to count the days of his new Nazirite vow.”]*

C. *Come and take note: since the concluding clause states, [...on account of these, the Nazirite does not cut his hair or sprinkle himself on the third and seventh days and he does not lose the prior days [observed in cleanness]. And he begins to count forthwith [after immersion and sunset] [M. 7:3D-E], it stands to reason that the initial matching clause intends, what is the meaning of, **only after he is made clean**? It means, after he will have presented his offerings, and who is the authority? It would be rabbis. For they maintain, the Naziriteship after purification commences on the eighth day [that is, the completion of the purification rite through sunset on the seventh day is required].*

- A. But as to [uncleanness contracted by overshadowing] interlaced foliage, projecting stones, a grave area, foreign land, the sealing stone and the buttressing stone [of a grave],
- B. a quarter log of blood, and a tent, and a quarter qab of bones, and utensils that touch a corpse,
- C. and because of the days of counting [after producing a symptom of sara'at (Lev. 14: 8)] and the days during which he is certified [unclean with sara'at]

- D. on account of these, the Nazirite does not cut his hair or sprinkle himself on the third and seventh days [54B] and he does not lose the prior days [observed in cleanness].
- E. And he begins to count forthwith [after immersion and sunset].
- F. And he is not subject to bringing an offering.
- G. Truly did they rule: The days [of uncleanness] by reason of being a zab or zabah (Lev. 15: 2, 25, 28), and the days of being shut up as mesora (Lev. 13: 4-10, these [nonetheless] go to his credit [in counting out his Nazirite days].

I.1 A. But as to [uncleanness contracted by overshadowing] interlaced foliage, projecting stones, a grave area:

- B. What is the definition of "interlaced foliage"?
- C. It is a tree that overhangs the ground.
- D. And projecting stones?
- E. These are stones that protrude from a fence.

II.1 A. foreign land:

- B. *The question was asked: as to the air did sages make their decree of uncleanness [so that entering the airspace of gentile land imparts uncleanness], or perhaps the enactment was only with reference to the soil [so touching it imparts uncleanness, but merely breathing it while not touching does not]?*
- C. *Come and take note: **hair or sprinkle himself on the third and seventh days.** Now if you maintain that the decree concerned the airspace, what need is there to sprinkle on the third and seventh day [which pertains to contracting corpse uncleanness through contact, not through being in the same air space, on account of which sprinkling is not required]! So is it not on account of the character of the soil [which is assumed to contained corpse-matter]?*
- D. *No, in point of fact, I shall say to you, it is on account of the air space, and when the Mishnah-rule makes the statement that it does, it pertains to the other items on the list but not to that one. And that stands to reason, since the Mishnah-text states, **and utensils that touch a corpse**, and, after all, are utensils subject to sprinkling? [Of course not.] [Utensils that are in contact with the dead do not convey uncleanness to man in such a way as to render him a Father of uncleanness.] So the inference is required that the statement it pertains to the other items on the list but not to that one.*

- E. **[55A]** *May we say that the dispute follows the lines of what is subject to debate among the following Tannaite authorities: He who enters the land of the peoples riding in a box, chest, or cupboard —Rabbi declares him unclean. R. Yosé b. R. Judah declares him clean. Is this not what is at stake in the dispute: Rabbi maintains that it was as to the air did sages make their decree of uncleanness, while R. Yosé b. R. Judah maintains that it was with reference to the soil.*
- F. *No, all parties maintain that it was because of with reference to the soil. What is at issue in the dispute? The one authority holds that a moving tent is not classified as a tent, and the other authority maintains, a moving tent is classified as a tent.*
- G. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “A box that is full of utensils which one tossed [inclusive of the contents] before a corpse in a tent is unclean, but if it was lying still, it is clean”? Rather, all parties concur that it was on account of the air space that rabbis made their decree, and the one party maintains that, since because travel in a box is uncommon, the rabbis did not make their decree to pertain to such a situation, and the other authority maintains that, while such a form of travel is uncommon, rabbis did make their decree to that effect.*
- H. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **He who enters the land of the gentiles in an ark, box, or cupboard is clean. [He who enters] in a carriage, a wagon, a boat, or on a raft, is unclean [T. Ahilot 18:5A].***
- I. *And if you prefer, I shall propose: here what is at issue is whether a man carried in a chest is unclean lest he poke out his head or the greater part of his body [and at that point would contract unclean by reason of overshadowing the gentile land].*
- J. *For has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “He who enters gentile territory in a chest, box, or armoire is clean until he pokes his head or the greater part of his body into that airspace.”*

III.1 A. And he begins to count forthwith [after immersion and sunset]:

- B. *Said R. Hisda, “They have taught this rule [on in connection with the days of certified uncleanness by reason of the skin ailment are not counted] only in the case of a minimal Nazirite vow, but in the case of a protracted Nazirite vow, they also discharge the days of his Naziriteship.” [A long Nazirite vow, extending beyond thirty days, even if the period of the certified uncleanness is counted, will encompass thirty days.]*
- C. *Objected R. Sherabayya, “**And he begins to count forthwith [after immersion and sunset]... and he does not lose the prior days [observed in cleanness].?** [Klien: it is clear that there has been a break in the counting.] *Under what circumstances? Should I say it is a short Naziriteship, then he still have to have thirty days for growing hair! [55B] So does it not deal with a protracted Nazirite vow? And lo, the Tannaite formulation states, **And he begins to count forthwith [after immersion and sunset]...**”**
- D. *He raised the question and he himself responded to his own challenge: “At issue is a Naziriteship of fifty days, of which he has sat for twenty days and then the marks of sara’at turned up on him. He cut his hair for the rite of sara’at, and then he observed thirty days as a Nazirite, in which case he has produced an*

adequate growth of hair.” [Klien: the days of the skin ailment cannot then be counted, since he would not have thirty days left.]

- E. *Objected R. Ami bar Hama [to Hisda’s theory], “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] [He is subject to doubt whether he had been certified with sara’at on the day on which he became a Nazirite, having been healed the same day, so Klien. He proceeds: “A Nazirite who becomes unclean must cut the hair on becoming clean, and a person with sara’at shaves his body twice on recovering. Since this Nazirite may not have been unclean nor may he have been afflicted with the skin ailment, he cannot shave his head during the period of his Naziriteship. He must therefore count the full period before shaving because of the doubt and allow a similar period to pass before the second and third shaving. Since he may have been both afflicted with sara’at and unclean because of corpse uncleanness, he must count a fourth period for his Naziriteship in purity] [56A] eats Holy Things after sixty days [= two Nazirite periods (he will have shaved twice for his sara’at)]. And he drinks wine and contracts corpse uncleanness after a hundred-and-twenty days [four Nazirite periods]. 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. 8:2]. And on this passage we have a Tannaite gloss: Under what circumstances? In the case of a minimal Nazirite vow, but in the case of a Naziriteship of a year, he may eat Holy Things [only] after two years and drink wine and contract corpse uncleanness after four years [T. 6:1]. Now, if you should suppose that the days of the certified uncleanness by reason of the skin ailment serve to fulfill his Naziriteship, then three years and thirty days should suffice.” [Klien: the third hair cut takes place after two years and thirty days, thirty days being the time for a growth of hair, and the rest of the year will be coincident with the time of his skin ailment; since this is not the case, it follows that the days of his uncleanness with the skin ailment are not reckoned towards the Naziriteship.]*

- F. *[Citing Sifré to Number’s,] objected R. Ashi [to Hisda’s proposal], “I know only that the days on which a Nazirite is actually unclean do not count toward the fulfillment of his vow. How do we know the rule covering the days that [a Nazirite, who produces symptoms of leprosy in line with the rules of Lev. 13-14] is shut up [awaiting the priest’s inspection after a week]? It is a matter of reason. Since the days on which the Nazirite is unclean impose the requirement of cutting the hair and bringing an offering, and the days that a Nazirite [afflicted with symptoms of leprosy] is shut up end in his having to have his hair cut and bringing an offering, I draw an analogy from the days that the Nazirite is unclean, which do not count for his Nazirite vow, and conclude that the days on which he is shut up likewise will not count for his Nazirite vow. No, the analogy is not all that compelling. For if you have stated the argument concerning the days on which the Nazirite is unclean, which wipe out the credit of the preceding days he has observed, so those days will not go to his credit either. But will you say the same of the days on*

which he is shut up, which do not cause him to lose the credit of the days already observed as a Nazirite? Therefore they should go to his credit. You may then construct an argument *a fortiori*: If one who is subject to the Nazirite oath as regards the graveyard, and whose hair is worthy of being cut off on account of the Nazirite vow, does not gain credit for the days on which he is unclean, the days on which one is shut up, on account of which the hair is not suitable to be cut off in fulfillment of the Nazirite vow, surely should not go to his credit. That furthermore is indeed the rule for the days of [the leper's] counting [clean days, prior to his bringing his offerings in conclusion of his rites of purification]. [That is, the days on which he counts a week from the disappearance of the marks of leprosy until he brings his offering also *will* go to the credit of fulfilling the Nazirite vow, should the leper be subject to such a vow.] Or might it be the case that just as the days on which the suspected leper is shut up do not go to his credit in fulfillment of his Nazirite vow, so the days on which he is subject to a final decision as to his uncleanness should not go to his credit. And it is a matter of logic: [56B] Just as the days on which he is shut up are days on which he has the power to impart uncleanness to objects used for lying or sitting on which he may lie or sit, and the days on which he is decisively unclean are such that he exercises the same power of contamination, if I draw an analogy to the days of his being shut up, which do not go to his credit as to his Nazirite vow, so the days on which he is decisively unclean should not go to his credit. No, if you have made that rule in connection with the days on which he is shut up [awaiting determination of his case], which do not go to his credit, in point of fact he has to get his hair cut and bring an offering [at the conclusion of the spell], and on that account the days should not go to his credit. But will you say the same of the days on which he is determined decisively to be unclean, on which he does not have to have his hair cut and bring an offering? Therefore those days should go to his credit. On the basis of this rather complex series of possible arguments, sages have ruled: The days on which a leper is shut up and the days on which he counts out [the spell awaiting completion of the purification rites] fall into the same classification. But the days on which one is afflicted with flux, either in the case of a male or in the case of a female, and the days on which a leper is decisively put away as unclean -- lo, these do go to the credit [of a Nazirite, toward the completion of his vow] [M. Naz. 7:3G] [given in the version of Sifré to Numbers XXI:III.2]. *Now, in any event, the Tannaite formulation states, For if you have stated the argument concerning the days on which the Nazirite is unclean, which wipe out the credit of the preceding days he has observed, so those days will not go to his credit either. But will you say the same of the days on which he is shut up, which do not cause him to lose the credit of the days already observed as a Nazirite — Now to what sort of Naziriteship is reference made here? Should I say, to a minimal one? But then we have to have thirty days for the growth of hair, and there is none [if we reckon the days prior to the advent of the skin ailment]. So it must make reference to a protracted Naziriteship, and yet the Tannaite formulation is clear: which do not go to his credit! From this it*

follows that the period in which he is certified with the skin ailment is never counted [contrary to Hisda's thesis].

G. *That proves the point.*

7:4A-C

- A. **Said R. Eleazar [b. Shammua] in the name of R. Joshua, "For every form of corpse uncleanness on account of which a Nazirite cuts his hair are people liable on account of entering the sanctuary.**
- B. **"And for every form of corpse uncleanness on account of which a Nazirite does not cut his hair, people are not liable on account of coming into the sanctuary."**
- C. **Said R. Meir, "Let this matter not be less stringent [than when uncleanness is contracted] from a dead creeping thing."** [Klien: Meir's argument is: since there is a penalty for entering the Temple after defilement by a reptile, although the person so defiled does not have to be sprinkled on the third and seventh days, then in the case of defilement by a corpse for which a Nazirite need not cut the hair, just as he need not after defilement by a reptile, there (still) should be a penalty on entering the Temple, for in this case he must be sprinkled on the third and seventh days.]

I.1 A. *Did R. Eleazar derive this statement from R. Joshua? And lo, he derived it from R. Joshua bar Mammal, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Eleazar, "When I went to 'Ardasqim, I came upon R. Meir and R. Judah b. Petera, the Chief, who were in session and reasoning about matters of law before R. Meir. R. Judah b. Paterah said, 'On account of [Bavli: every form of uncleanness deriving from a corpse] a quarter-log of blood on account of which a Nazir does cut his hair, people are liable who come into the sanctuary or touch its Holy Things, and on account of any form of uncleanness deriving from a corpse on account of which the Nazirite does not have to cut his hair, people are not liable who come to the sanctuary or touch its Holy Things. Said to him R. Meir, 'Now why should this be less stringent than a dead creeping thing [M. Naz. 7:4C]. Now if on account of a dead creeping thing, which is of lesser weight, a Nazir cuts his hair, and they are liable for entering the sanctuary and touching its Holy Things, on account of a quarter-log of blood, which is more stringent, is it not logical that a Nazir should cut his hair and that people should be liable for entering the sanctuary and touching its Holy Things?' [T.'s version:] Judah b. Peterah remained silent before him. I said to him, 'Meir, don't disgrace him. He was an expert in your behalf in the matter of Joshua b. Mamal.' He said to me, 'Indeed so, and he was a true master of laws.' I stated to him [a rule] in the following language: 'He said to me in the name of R. Joshua: 'On account of any form of corpse-uncleanness on account of which the Nazir cuts his hair are they liable for entering the sanctuary, and on account of any form of corpse-uncleanness because of which a Nazir does not cut his hair, they are not liable or entering the sanctuary' [M. Naz. 7:4A]. And I recognize the correctness of his opinion" [T. 5:1K-M]. So it follows that he derived it from R. Joshua bar Mammal,*

- B. They said: *It follows that in the case of any tradition that is stated in the names of three authorities, the first and the third do we state, but the middle one do we not state.*
- C. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "We too have learned the same rule on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon of Mispah sowed [his field with two types of wheat]. [The matter came] before Rabban Gamaliel. So they went up to the Chamber of Hewn Stone, and asked [about the law regarding sowing two types of wheat in one field]. Said Nahum the Scribe, "I have received [the following ruling] from R. Miasha, who received it. from his father, who received it from the Pairs, who received it from the Prophets, [who received] the law [given] to Moses on Sinai, regarding one who sows his field with two types of wheat: If he harvests [the wheat] in one lot, he designates one [portion of produce as] peah. If he harvests [the wheat] in two lots, he designates two [portions of produce as] peah." [M. Peah 2:6]. Now Joshua and Caleb are not taken into account."*
- D. *That proves the point.*

7:4D-I

- D. **Said R. Aqiba, "I reasoned before R. Eliezer as follows:**
- E. **"Now if on account of a bone the bulk of a barley kernel, which does not impart uncleanness to a man in a tent, a Nazirite nonetheless cuts his hair for touching or carrying it [M. 7:2F],**
- F. **"a quarter-log of blood, which does impart uncleanness to man in a tent —**
- G. **"is it not logical that a Nazirite should cut off his hair for having touched or carried it' [vs. M. 7:3B]?"**
- H. **"He said to me, 'Now what's going on, Aqiba! In this area of law, people don't adduce arguments a fortiori at all!'"**
- I. **"But when I came and laid matters out before R. Joshua, he said to me, 'You stated matters very well. But thus have they ruled that the law should be.'"**
- I.1 A. **[57A]** *The question was raised: is the matter of the measurement of a bone the size of a barley grain a matter of received law, and the matter of the quarter-log of blood derived from the argument a fortiori, and in the case of a received law people don't adduce argument a fortiori at all? Or perhaps it is the matter of the quarter log of blood that is the matter of received law, the rule governing the bone the size of a barley grain being derived from an argument a fortiori, and the case of a received law people don't adduce arguments a fortiori at all?*
- B. *Come and take note: the matter of the measurement of a bone the size of a barley grain a matter of received law, and the matter of the quarter-log of blood derived from the argument a fortiori, and the case of a received law people don't adduce argument a fortiori at all*