

blood on his finger is disqualified for splashing upon another corner. (3) Of all the sacrifices, none require splashing the blood with the [priest's] finger except for a [chata] sin-offering, about which it declares, "The priest should dip his finger in the blood."

(ibid., verse 6) There must be enough blood

for the dipping [of his finger, and] not that his finger should wipe up blood [from the walls of the vessel].

ואחר כך טובל פעם שניה ששירי הדם שבאצבעו פסולין לתן מהן על קרן אחרת: ג אין בכל הקרבנות קרבן שטעון הזית דם באצבעו אלא חטאת בלבד שנאמר בה (שם) וטבל אצבעו בדם. וצריך שיהיה שם דם כדי טבילה. לא שייספג אצבעו מדם:

METZORA FOR THURSDAY NIGHT

מצורע ליל ששי

צירוף יהיה

כו וידי כהנא באצבעיה דימינא מן משחא די על ידיה דשמאלא שבע זמנין קדם יי: כח ויתן כהנא מן משחא די על ידיה על רום אודנא דמדכפי דימינא ועל אליון ידיה דימינא ועל אליון רגליה דימינא על אתר דמא דאשמא: כט ודישתאר מן משחא די על ידא דכהנא יתן על רישא דמדכפי לכפרא

כו והנה הכהן באצבעו הימנית מן השמן אשר על-כפו השמאלית שבע פעמים לפני ידוה: כח ונתן הכהן מן השמן אשר על-כפו על-תנוך און המטהר הימנית ועל-בהן ידו הימנית ועל-בהן רגלו הימנית על-מקום דם האשם: כט והנותר מן השמן אשר על-כף הכהן יתן על-

(27) And the priest will sprinkle with his right index finger some of the oil that is in his [or the other's] left palm, seven times before the Lord. (28) And the priest will place some of the oil that is in his palm, above the right earlobe of the person being purified, on the thumb of his right hand and on the big toe of his right foot, on top of the place [where] the guilt-offering blood [had been applied]. (29) And what is left over from the oil that is in the priest's palm, he should place upon the head of the person being purified, to effect atonement

RASHI

רש"י

(28) On top of the place [where] the guilt-offering blood [had been applied]

(כח) על מקום דם האשם. אפלו נתקנח הדם; למד

— even if this blood had been wiped off [the priest must nevertheless apply the oil above the earlobe and on the thumb and big toe, because the verse says to place the oil "on top of the place," not "on top of the blood," i.e.] this teaches us that the blood is not the determining

עֲלוּהִי קָדָם יי: ל וַיַּעֲבֹד ית
 חד מן שְׁפִינִיָּא אוּ מן בְּנֵי
 יוֹנָא מְדֵי תְדַבֵּק יְדִיה: לא ית
 די תְּדַבֵּק יְדִיה ית חד חֲטָאתָא
 וַיִּת חד עֲלֵתָא על מִנְחָתָא
 וַיִּכְפֹּר כְּהֵנָּא על דְּמִדְּפֵי קָדָם
 יי: לב דָּא אֹרִיתָא די בֵּיה
 מִכְתֵּשׁ סָגִירוּ די לָא תְּדַבֵּק
 יְדִיה בְּדִכּוּתֵיה: לג וּמְלִיל יי
 עִם מֹשֶׁה וְעִם אַהֲרֹן לְמִימְרָ:
 לד אַרְי תַּעֲלוּן לְאַרְעָא דְכְּנָעַן
 די אֲנָא זָהָב לְכוּן לְאַחֲסָנָא
 וְאַתֵּן מִכְתֵּשׁ סָגִירוּ בְּבֵית

רֹאשׁ הַמִּטְהָר לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו לְפָנֵי יְדוּהַ:
 ל וַעֲשֵׂה אֶת־הָאֶחָד מִן־הַתְּרִים אוּ מִן־בְּנֵי
 הַיּוֹנָה מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁיֵג יְדוּ: לא אֶת אֲשֶׁר־
 תִּשְׁיֵג יְדוּ אֶת־הָאֶחָד חֲטָאת וְאֶת־הָאֶחָד
 עֲלֶה עַל־הַמִּנְחָה וְכִפֹּר הַכֹּהֵן עַל הַמִּטְהָר
 לְפָנֵי יְדוּהַ: לב זֹאת תּוֹרַת אֲשֶׁר־בוּ נִגַּע
 צָרַעַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִשְׁיֵג יְדוּ בְּטַהֲרָתוֹ: פ
 רביעי שיש במחוברין לג וַיְדַבֵּר יְדוּהַ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
 וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵאמֹר: לד כִּי תָבֹאוּ אֶל־אֶרֶץ
 כְּנָעַן אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי נֹתֵן לָכֶם לְאֶחְזָה וְנִתְתִּי

for him, before the Lord. (30) He will then perform [the service of] one of the turtle-doves or of the young doves, from whatever he could afford. (31) [So, from] that which he could afford, one should be as a sin-offering, and one should be as a burnt-offering, besides the meal-offering, and the priest will effect atonement for the person being purified, before the Lord. (32) This, then, is the law of one in whom is the affliction of *tzara'at*, who could not afford [the full array of sacrifices], when he is to be purified. (33) And the Lord spoke to Moshe and to Aharon, saying, (34) When you will come to the land of Canaan, which I am giving you as a possession, and I shall place the affliction

RASHI

factor here, but rather, the "place" [where the blood had already been applied] is the determining factor here (Torat Kohanim 14:54; Menachot 10a). (34) I shall place the

affliction of tzara'at [upon a house] — [The verse should have said, "and if there will be the affliction of tzara'at upon a house." But since it says "I shall place ...,"] this is a [good] tidings for the people of Israel, namely, that afflictions of tzara'at will befall these [houses] (Torat Kohanim 14:75). [And why is this good news?!] Because the Ammorites had hidden away treasures of gold inside the walls of their houses during all of the forty years in which the people of Israel were in the desert. And because of the affliction [of tzara'at that befell an Ammorite

רש"י

שְׁאִין הָדָם גֹּרֵם אֶלֶּא הַמְּקוֹם גֹּרֵם: (לד) וְנִתְתִּי נִגַּע
 צָרַעַת. בְּשׂוֹרָה הִיא לָהֶם, שְׁהַנְּגָעִים בָּאִים עֲלֵיהֶם,
 לְפִי שְׁהִטְמִינוּ אֲמוֹרִיִּים מִטְּמוּנֵיּוֹת שֶׁל זָהָב בְּקִירוֹת

אֲרָעָא אַחְסַנְתְּכוֹן: לַה וַיִּיְתִי
 דְּדִילִיָּה בֵּיתָא וַיְחֹזִי לְכַהֲנָא
 לְמִימְרָא כְּמַכְתָּשָׂא אֲתַחְזִי לִי
 בְּבֵיתָא: לו וַיִּפְקֹד כַּהֲנָא
 וַיִּפְנֹן יְת בֵּיתָא עַד לֹא יַעוּל
 כַּהֲנָא לְמַחְזִי יְת מַכְתָּשָׂא וְלֹא
 יִסְתַּאב כּל דִּי בְּבֵיתָא וּבִתְרָא
 כּוּן יַעוּל כַּהֲנָא לְמַחְזִי יְת

נִגַּע צֹרַעַת בְּבַיִת אֲרֶץ אַחֲזַתְכֶם: לַה וּבָא
 אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ הַפֵּיִת וְהִגִּיד לַפֹּהֵן לֵאמֹר כִּנְגַע
 נִרְאָה לִי בַּבַּיִת: לו וְצֹוֹה הַפֹּהֵן וּפְנֹו אֶת-
 הַבַּיִת בְּטָרָם יָבֵא הַפֹּהֵן לְרֹאוֹת אֶת-הַנֶּגַע
 וְלֹא יִטְמָא כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בַּבַּיִת וְאַחֲרַיִן כֵּן יָבֵא

of *tzara'at* upon a house in the land of your possession, (35) And the one who owns the house will come and tell the priest, saying, Something like an affliction has appeared to me on the house. (36) Then the priest will order that they empty out the house, before the priest comes to look at the affliction, so that everything in the house will not become impure. After this, the priest will

RASHI

house now dispossessed by Israel], they would have to demolish the house (see verses 43-45 below), and consequently, the people of Israel would find these treasures (Vayikra Rabbah 17:6). (35) Something like an affliction has appeared to me on the house — Even if [the owner of the house is a] Torah scholar who therefore knows full well that it is most definitely an affliction of tzara'at, nevertheless, he must not make his statement using a decisive expression, saying, “An affliction has appeared to me,” but rather, he should say, “Something like an affliction has appeared to me” [thus teaching us proper manners] (Nega'im 12:5). (36) [That they empty out the house,] before the priest comes — because as long as the priest has not yet addressed the house [in question], the law of impurity does not yet apply to it. So that everything in the house will not become impure — because if they do not empty the house, and the priest meanwhile comes and looks at the affliction, then [from the point when he sees the affliction onwards,] the house must be quarantined and everything inside it becomes impure. Now, upon which items did the Torah have compassion [to spare them from becoming impure by having them removed before the priest arrives]? If it was upon vessels which require immersion [in a mikvah to purify them], then [instead of having them removed,] let the person immerse them, thereby purifying them. And if it was upon food and drink, then [instead of removing them, let them become impure] and he can eat [and drink] them during his period of impurity. However, the Torah here wishes to spare earthenware vessels, which cannot be

רש"י

בְּתִיבָהּ כָּל אַרְבַּעִים שָׁנָה שֶׁהָיוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמִדְבָּר, וְעַל
 יְדֵי הַנֶּגַע נוֹתֵץ הַבַּיִת וּמוֹצֵאן: (לַה) כִּנְגַע נִרְאָה לִי
 בַּבַּיִת. אֶפְלוּ תַלְמִיד חֲכָם שִׂוְדַע שֶׁהוּא נִגַע וְדָאֵי,
 לֹא יִפְסַק דְּבַר בְּרוּר לֹדְמֵר: נִגַע נִרְאָה לִי, אֶלֶּא:
 “כִּנְגַע נִרְאָה לִי” (לו) בְּטָרָם יָבֵא הַפֹּהֵן וְכוּ'. שְׂכַל
 זְמַן שְׂאִין כְּהֵן נִזְקַק לוֹ, אִין שָׁם תּוֹרַת טְמֵאָה: וְלֹא
 יִטְמָא כָּל אֲשֶׁר בַּבַּיִת. (ת"כ) שָׁאֵם לֹא יִפְנֹהוּ וַיָּבֵא
 הַכֹּהֵן וַיִּרְאָה הַנֶּגַע, נִזְקַק לְהַסְגֵּר וְכָל מַה שֶּׁבְּתוֹכוֹ
 יִטְמָא. וְעַל מַה חֲסָה תּוֹרָה? אִם עַל כְּלֵי שִׁטְף –
 יִטְבִּילֵם וַיִּטְהָרוּ, וְאִם עַל אֶבְלִין וּמִשְׁקִין, יֵאָכְלֵם

ביתא: לו ויחזי ית מכתשא
 והא מכתשא בכתלי ביתא
 פתחין ירקון או סמקון
 ומחזיהון מפיך מן כתלא:
 לח ויפוק כהנא מן ביתא
 לתרע ביתא ויסגר ית ביתא
 שבועא יומין: לט ויתוב כהנא
 ביומא שביעאה ויחזי והא
 אוסיף מכתשא בכתלי ביתא:
 מ ויפקד כהנא וישלפון ית
 אבניא די בהון מכתשא
 וירמוזן יתהון לקרתא לאתר
 מסאב: מא וית ביתא יקלפון
 מגיו סחור סחור וירמוזן ית

הִפְתֵּן לְרֵאוֹת אֶת־הַבַּיִת: לו וְרָאָה אֶת־
 הַנֶּגַע וְהִנֵּה הַנֶּגַע בְּקִירֵת הַבַּיִת שֶׁקְעוּרוֹת
 יִרְקַקֶּת אוֹ אֲדָמָדָמַת וּמְרֵאִיתָן שָׁפַל מִן־
 הַקִּיר: לח וַיֵּצֵא הַכֹּהֵן מִן־הַבַּיִת אֶל־פֶּתַח
 הַבַּיִת וְהִסְגִּיר אֶת־הַבַּיִת שִׁבְעַת יָמִים:
 לט וְשָׁב הַכֹּהֵן בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה
 פָּשָׂה הַנֶּגַע בְּקִירֵת הַבַּיִת: מ וְצִוָּה הַכֹּהֵן
 וְחִלְצוּ אֶת־הָאֲבָנִים אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶן הַנֶּגַע
 וְהִשְׁלִיכוּ אֹתָהֶן אֶל־מַחוּץ לְעִיר אֶל־מְקוֹם
 טָמֵא: מא וְאֶת־הַבַּיִת יִקְצַע מִבַּיִת סָבִיב

come to look at the house. (37) And he will look at the affliction. Now, [if] the affliction in the walls of the house appear sunken and are *yerakrak* green or *adamdam* red, appearing as if deeper than the wall, (38) Then the priest will go out of the house to the house entrance, and he must quarantine the house for seven days. (39) Then the priest will return on the seventh day, and he will look [at the house]. Now, [if] the affliction has increased in size in the walls of the house, (40) Then the priest will order that they remove the stones upon which the affliction is, and they must cast them off outside the city, to an impure place. (41) And he must have the inside of his house scraped out, surrounding

RASHI

purified by [immersion in] a mikvah [and would thus undergo permanent damage if they became impure] (Nega'im 12:5).

(37) שקעורות — means: [Afflictions in the walls, with a] sunken (שוקעות) appearance (Torat Kohanim 14:89). (40) וחלצו את האבנים — [The word וחלצו is to be understood] as the Targum translates it: וישלפון, i.e., “they

should remove them from there,” similar to the verse (Deuteronomy 25:9), “[Then his brother's wife should ...] remove (וחלצה) his shoe,” thus [the root חלץ] denotes “removal.” **To an impure place** — i.e., a place where pure articles will not be used. This verse teaches us that these [impure] stones defile the place in which they are located, while they are there. (41) יקצע

רש"י

בימי טמאתו. הא לא חסה התורה, אלא על כלי חרס, שאין להם טהרה במקוה: (לו) שקעורות. (ת"כ) שוקעות במראיתן: (מ) וחלצו את האבנים. בתרגומו: וישלפון, יטלום משם, כמו: “וחלצה נעלו”, לשון הסרה: אל מקום טמא. מקום שאין טהרות משתמשות שם. לפיך הכתוב, שהאבנים הללו מטמאות מקומן בעודן בו: (מא) יקצע.

מד וייעול פהנא ויחזי והא
אוסף מכתשא בביתא סגירות
מחסרא היא בביתא מסאב

מד ובא הפהן וראה והנה פשה הנגע בבית
צרעת ממארת הוא בבית טמא הוא:

affliction returns, recurring in the house, (44) Then the priest will come and look [at it]. Now, [if] the affliction in the house has increased in size, then it is

RASHI

namely,] ואם ישוב, "and if ... [the affliction] returns;" and just as in verse 39, the return (שיבה) of the priest was at the end of one week, so too here [through the exposition of a גזירה שוה, a tradition handed down by our Rabbis, which links two seemingly unrelated passages through common terms, thereby applying the laws of one passage to the other], the return (שיבה) of the affliction [referred to in our verse is only] at the end of one week [and if the affliction recurs on that same day or, in fact, any time before the end of one week, it is not deemed impure, since a full week must be given for the affliction to heal] (Torat Kohanim 14:105). (44) Then the priest

will come and look [at it]. Now, [if] the affliction ... has increased in size — [From here,] one might think that a recurrent affliction [in a house] can only be deemed impure if it increases in size. However, Scripture employs the term צרעת ממארת "painful tzara'at" here in reference to tzara'at in houses, and it also employs the same term צרעת ממארת in reference to tzara'at in garments (see verse 13:52); [and through the exposition of a גזירה שוה,] just as over there [in the case of garments,] a recurrent affliction is deemed impure even if it had not increased in size, so too, here [in the case of houses], a recurrent affliction is deemed impure, even if it had not increased in size. But if this is so, what does our verse here come to teach us, when it says, "Now, [if] the affliction ... has increased in size ...?" [Rashi explains, in answer to this question, that the verses here must not be understood by reading them in the order in which they are written. Rather, they must be read in a different order, because] this is not the actual place for this verse [i.e., the first section of this verse, namely, "Then the priest will come and look [at it]. Now [if] the affliction in the house has increased in size," is to be understood by inserting it in a different location within these verses, as follows]. Verse 45, "He must demolish the house ...," should be [read as if] written after verse 43, "And if ... the affliction returns ..." [thus, skipping over the first section of verse 44,] and then [reinserting this first section of our verse] "Then the priest will come and look ... the affliction in the house has increased in size" [after verse 47. Thus, the sequence of events in these verses is as follows: a) Verse 43, the affliction recurs after removal of impure stones, scraping and replastering;

רש"י

"ואם ישוב". מה 'שיבה' האמורה להלן בסוף שבוע, אף 'שיבה' האמורה כאן בסוף שבוע: (מד) ובא הפהן וראה והנה פשה. יכול, לא יהא החוזר טמא, אלא אם כן פשה? נאמר: "צרעת ממארת" בבתים ונאמר: "צרעת ממארת" בבגדים: מה להלן, טמא את החוזר אף על פי שאינו פושה, אף כאן טמא את החוזר אף על פי שאינו פושה. אם כן, מה תלמוד לומר: "והנה פשה"? אין כאן מקומו של מקרא זה, אלא "ונתן את הבית" הנה לו לכתב אחר: "ואם ישוב הנגע... וראה והנה פשה" הא, לא בא ללמד, אלא על נגע העומד בעיניו בשבוע ראשון ובא בסוף שבוע שני ומצאו שפשה, שלא פרש בו

מה וְנָתַן אֶת־הַבַּיִת אֶת־אַבְנֵי וְאֶת־עֵצָיו הוּא: מה וַיִּתְּרַע יָת בַּיְתָא יָת

tzara'at mam'eret in the house; it is impure. (45) He must demolish the house,

RASHI

b) the latter section of verse 44 and then verse 45: the affliction is “painful *tzara'at*,” it is impure and demolition and permanent removal is required; c) verses 46 and 47: anyone entering the house becomes impure and anyone lying down or eating in it must immerse his body and garments; d) only now comes our case of the first section of verse 44: the affliction increases in size, as follows]. Now, [when our verse says that the priest looks at the affliction, the phrase, “[if] the affliction ... has increased in size”] comes to teach us about only a particular case, namely, if an affliction [in a house] remains the same during the first week [of quarantine], but when the priest came at the end of the second

week [of quarantine], he found that the affliction had now increased in size. For in the earlier verses, Scripture does not explicitly tell us about a case where the affliction had remained the same after the first week [of quarantine]. Here, though, when Scripture refers to the affliction increasing in size, it is exclusively describing the case where the affliction has remained the same for the first week, but increased in size during the second week. So what [does Scripture tell us] to do in this case? One might suggest that this house must be demolished, since in the actual written order of the verses, Scripture follows with (verse 45), “He must demolish the house ...”. Scripture, however, says (verse 39), “the priest will return,” and (in our verse), “the priest will come;” here, the terms “returning” and “coming” are linked, as follows: just as in the case of “returning” [i.e., when the priest returned after one week and the affliction had increased], the impure stones are removed, the house is scraped and replastered, and another week of quarantine is applied, so too, here, in our case of “coming” [i.e., where the affliction has remained the same for the first week, but increased in size during the second week], the owner of the house [does not demolish the house, but rather, at the end of the second week he] must remove the impure stones, scrape, replaster and then apply another [here, a third] week of quarantine. After this, if the affliction recurs again, the house must be demolished, while if the affliction does not recur, the house is pure. Now, how do we know that in a case where the affliction remained the same during the first and second weeks, we [also] remove the impure

רש"י

הכתוב למעלה בלום בעומד בעינו בשבוע ראשון. ולמדך כאן בפשיון זה, שאינו מדבר אלא בעומד בראשון ופשה בשני. ומה יעשה לו? יכול, יתצנו כמו שסמך לו: “ונתן את הבית?” תלמוד לומר: “ושב הפה”, “ובא הפה”, נלמד ביאה משיבה; מה שיבה חולץ וקוצה וטח ונתן לו שבוע, אף ביאה חולץ וקוצה וטח ונתן לו שבוע, ואם חוזר, נותן, לא חוזר, טהור. ומנין שאם עמד בזה ובה חולץ וקוצה וטח? ונתן לו שבוע? תלמוד לומר: “ובא”, “ואם בא יבא”, במה הכתוב מדבר? אם בפשה בראשון, הרי כבר אמור, אם בפשה בשני, הרי כבר אמור. הא אינו אמור: “ובא”. “ואם בא יבא”. אלא את שבא בסוף שבוע ראשון ובא בסוף שבוע שני: “וראה והנה לא פשה”. זה העומד מה יעשה לו? יכול, יפטר וילך, כמו שכתוב כאן: “וטהר את

וְאֵת כָּל-עֵפֶר הַבַּיִת וְהוֹצִיא אֶל-מַחוּץ עֵפֶר בַּיְתָא וַיִּפֶק לְמִבְרָא אֲבֹנָהּ וַיֵּת אֶעֱוִהּ וַיֵּת כָּל

its stones, its wood and all the [mortar] dust of the house, and he must take

RASHI

stones, scrape, replaster and apply a [third] week [of quarantine]? Because Scripture says (in our verse), “the priest will come (ובא),” and in verse 48, it] says, “if the priest comes and comes [again] (בא יבא)” [i.e., in verse 48, Scripture employs the unusual expression בא יבא rather than simply saying ובא as in our verse, in order to teach us about the case of an affliction which remains the same during the first and second weeks. And how do

we know that this verse (48) refers to this case? Well,] what other case can that verse be referring to? If [you suggest that] it describes the case of an affliction which increased in size during the first week [of quarantine], then Scripture has already described this case [in verse 43]; and if [you suggest that verse 48 is] describing the case of an affliction which increases in size during the second week, this has also now been described [in Rashi's explanation of our verse]; so one must conclude that verse 48, “if the priest comes and comes [again],” is describing the particular case where the priest comes (בא) at the end of the first week [of quarantine] and comes [again] (יבא) at the end of the second week [of quarantine], and now looks at the affliction, and [continues verse 48], “beholds that the affliction did not increase in size” [i.e., it has remained the same throughout]. Now, in this case, then, of an affliction which remained the same [throughout the two quarantine weeks], what [does Scripture tell us] should be done? One might think that [since the affliction never increased in size,] the case is dismissed, [deemed pure,] and the priest departs, as that very verse says (48), “[then] the priest will [pronounce] the house pure.” Scripture, however, continues there, “because the affliction has healed,” i.e., Scripture deems the affliction here pure, only if it had healed. [But here, we wish to discover what to do in the case where the affliction had remained the same during the first and second weeks, and had not yet healed:] what is the law in this case? Well, “coming” is stated above [in verse 44, “the priest will come”], and “coming” is stated here [in verse 48, “if the priest comes ... and comes [again]”]; just as in the case above (verse 44), the owner of the house must remove the impure stones, scrape, replaster and apply a week of quarantine, a law which we learned through the link made between the terms “returning” and “coming,” so too, here, in our case in question [of an affliction that has remained the same through the two weeks, the owner must remove the impure stones, scrape, replaster and apply a week of quarantine]. The above is all taught in Torat Kohanim (14:105). The conclusion of this whole

רש"י

הבית? תלמוד לומר: "כי נרפא הנגע", לא טהרתהי אלא את הרפוי מה יעשה לו? ביאה' אמורה למעלה וביאה' אמורה למטה: מה בעליונה חולץ וקוצה וטח ונותן לו שבוע דגמר' לה זהו שיבה, זהו ביאה', אף בתחתונה, כך וכו' כדאימא ב'תורת כהנים'. גמרו' של דבר: אין נתיצה, אלא בנגע החזיר אחר חליצה וקצוי וטיחה, ואין החזיר צריך פשיון. וסדר המקראות כך הוא: "ואם ישוב", "ונתץ", "והבא אל הבית", "והאכל בבית", "ובא

לְעִיר אֶל-מְקוֹם טָמֵא: מִי וְהֵבֵא אֶל-הַבַּיִת
 כָּל-יְמֵי הַסְּגִיר אֹתוֹ יִטְמָא עַד-הָעֶרֶב:
 לְקִרְתָּא לְאֶתֶר מְסֻבָּב:
 מִי וְדִיִּיעוּל לְבֵיתָא כָּל יוֹמִין
 דִּיִּסְגַר יִתִּיה יְהִי מְסֻבָּב עַד

[them] outside the city, to an impure place. (46) And anyone entering the house during all the days of its quarantine, will become impure until the evening.

RASHI

רש"י

*matter is as follows: Demolition [of an afflicted house] is only required when the affliction had returned after removal of the impure stones, scraping, replastering [and applying another week of quarantine], and we do not require that this recurring affliction increase in size [for this demolition to be necessary]. Hence, the sequence of events in these verses [as mentioned above,] is as follows. (Verse 43), "And if... [the affliction] returns" [after removal of impure stones, scraping, replastering and applying a second week of quarantine; then (verse 44, second section), "it is tzara'at mam'eret ... it is impure"]; then (verse 45), "He must demolish the house ...," and (verse 46), "Anyone entering the house [... will become impure]," and (verse 47), "[And one who lies down ...] and one who eats in the house, [must immerse ...];" [at this juncture, just before verse 48, the second section of our verse (44) is now inserted in the sequence, namely,] "Then the priest will come and look ... the affliction in the house has increased in size" — [and as above, now we know that] Scripture here is referring to a case where the affliction remained the same during the first week [of quarantine], so a second week of quarantine is applied, and at the end of this second week of quarantine, the priest comes, looks at the affliction, and [sees that] it has increased in size. So, in this case what should be done? [Here, rather than an explicit verse to tell us, through linkage of terms in the verses as above, we learn that] the owner must remove the impure stones, scrape, replaster and apply another [i.e., a third] week [of quarantine]. Now, if [after this process,] the affliction recurs, then demolition is necessary, while if it did not recur [which is the case in verse 48 now, i.e., after this whole process it finally healed up, then the house is deemed pure, and] the birds are required [along with the whole purification procedure]. [We see here, that after the third week of quarantine described here, the afflicted house is either to be demolished or is deemed pure, depending on the circumstances; however, an affliction is not quarantined for a fourth week,] because afflictions are never quarantined for more than three weeks. [See Rashi on verse 48 below, which is understood in the light of this Rashi.] (46) **During all the days of its quarantine** — However, not [someone entering the house] during the days that he scrapes off the affliction [during which time the house does not defile those who enter it, until the quarantine period begins]. But [if this is so,] one might think, in the case of an*

הכהן ורָאָה וְהִנֵּה פֶשֶׁה". וְדַבֵּר הַכְּתוּב בְּעוֹמֵד בְּרֵאשׁוֹן, שְׁנוֹתָן לוֹ שְׁבוּעַ שְׁנֵי לְהַסְגִּירוֹ, וּבְסוּף שְׁבוּעַ שְׁנֵי לְהַסְגִּירוֹ בָּא וְרָאָה שְׁפִשָּׁה, וּמֵה יַעֲשֶׂה לוֹ? חוֹלֵץ וְקוֹרֵה וְטָח וְנוֹתֵן לוֹ שְׁבוּעַ. חוֹר – נוֹתֵן, לֹא חוֹר – טְעוֹן צְפָרִים, שְׂאִין בְּנִגְעִים יוֹתֵר מִשְׁלֶשָׁה שְׁבוּעוֹת: (מִי) כָּל יְמֵי הַסְּגִיר אֹתוֹ. וְלֹא יָמִים שְׁקֵלֶף אֶת נִגְעוֹ. יְכוּל, שְׂאֵנִי מוֹצִיא הַמַּחְלֵט שְׁקֵלֶף אֶת

רְמֹשָׂא׃ מִזֹּ וּדְיִשְׁכּוּב בְּבֵיתָא
 יִצְבַּע יָת לְבוּשׁוֹהִי וּדְיִיכּוּל
 בְּבֵיתָא יִצְבַּע יָת לְבוּשׁוֹהִי׃
 מִזֹּ וְאִם מֵעַל יִיעוּל כַּהֲנָא

מִזֹּ וְהִשְׁכַּב בְּבֵית יְכַבֵּס אֶת־בְּגָדָיו וְהֵאֵכַל
 בְּבֵית יְכַבֵּס אֶת־בְּגָדָיו׃ מִזֹּ וְאִם־בָּא יָבֵא

(47) And one who lies down in the house, must immerse [also] his garments [in a *mikvah*], and one who eats in the house, must immerse [also] his garments [in a *mikvah*]. (48) But if the priest comes [at the end of the first week] and comes [again at the end of the second week] and looks [at the affliction], and

RASHI

רש"י

affliction that is pronounced "definitely" impure [and must be demolished], that if the owner [disregarded the order to demolish the house, and rather, in an erroneous attempt to save his house, he removed the impure stones and] scraped off the affliction, then this case

is also excluded [i.e., this house will also not defile those entering it]. Scripture, however, says, "during all the days" [where the seemingly superfluous word "all" comes to include also this case, namely, that since this house is impure and must be demolished, it will always defile those who enter it] (Torat Kohanim 14:110). [And anyone entering the house ...] will become impure until the evening — [Because no mention of defilement of garments is made here, Scripture] teaches us that the house [in this case] does not defile the garments [of someone who enters it]. One might think that even if he remained in the house for the time period of כְּדֵי אֲכִילַת פֶּרֶס — the length of time it takes someone to eat an average meal, [i.e., half a loaf, then his garments would also remain undefiled]. Scripture, however, says (in the next verse), "one who eats in the house, must immerse [also] his garments" [teaching us that just like when he eats, and has remained in the house for the aforementioned length of time, his garments become defiled, so too, when one enters and remains the time period of כְּדֵי אֲכִילַת פֶּרֶס even without eating anything, his garments also become defiled]. [But how do we know this?] Perhaps we only know this law regarding eating, [i.e., only if one actually eats, because perhaps the very action of eating itself is the cause of the defilement of garments and not the time period. And if this is so,] how would we know that if someone lies down [in the house and remains for that length of time, also his garments become defiled]? Because Scripture says (in the next verse), "And one who lies down in the house, [must immerse (also) his garments," thereby proving that it is not the actual eating which causes the garment to become defiled, but rather, remaining in the house for the aforementioned time period]. But so far, we only know that this law applies to someone who either eats or lies down [i.e., perhaps the defilement of garments applies only when there is either an action of eating or lying down in the house]; how do we know that this law also applies to someone who did not eat or lie down [in the house, but rather, he merely remained in the house for that length of time, that his garments also become defiled]?

נִגְעוּ? תִּלְמוּד לומר: "כֹּל יָמָיו" יִטְמָא עַד הָעֶרֶב. מִלְּמוֹד, שְׂאִין מִטְמָא בְּגָדִים. יְכוּל, אֶפְלוּ שְׁהָה בְּכַדֵי אֲכִילַת פֶּרֶס? תִּלְמוּד לומר: "וְהֵאֵכַל בְּבֵית יְכַבֵּס אֶת בְּגָדָיו". אִין לִי אֶלָּא אוֹכֵל, שׁוֹכֵב מִנְּזַן? תִּלְמוּד לומר "וְהִשְׁכַּב". אִין לִי אֶלָּא אוֹכֵל וְשׁוֹכֵב, לֹא אוֹכֵל וְלֹא

וַיַּחֲזִי וְהָא לֹא אוֹסֵף מִכְתָּשָׂא
בְּבֵיתָא בִּתְר דְּאִתְשַׁע יְת בֵּיתָא

הַכֹּהֵן וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה לֹא־פָשָׂה הַנֶּגַע בַּבַּיִת

beholds that the affliction did not increase in size in the house, [then he orders it scraped and replastered, and] after the house has been plastered, the priest

RASHI

Because Scripture says (in the next verse), “must immerse ... must immerse.” [The repetition of this expression] comes to include [the case where the person merely remained in the house for that time period; even though he did not eat or lie down, his garments are defiled]. But if this is the case, [i.e., since one’s garments are defiled whenever he remains in the house for that time period, and not exclusively related to his eating or lying down, then] why does Scripture need to mention the specific cases of eating and lying down altogether? [These cases are specified,

in order to [link lying down to eating, insofar as] the measurement [of time that] it takes someone to eat an average meal is applied to one who lies down [i.e., only if someone lies down in the house for that period of time, do his garments become defiled] (Torat Kohanim 14:111). [The Rashi on the following verse is more clearly understood after one learns the Rashi on verse 44 above.] (48) But if the priest comes [...] and comes [again]— at the end of the second week [of quarantine], And looks [at the affliction], and beholds that the affliction did not increase in size — This verse comes to teach us about a case where the affliction has remained the same throughout [both] the first and second weeks [of quarantine]. And what should be done [in that case]? One might think that it should be pronounced pure, just as is apparent from the plain meaning of this verse, which continues, “the priest will [pronounce] the house pure.” Scripture, however, concludes the verse with, “because the affliction has healed,” i.e., Scripture deems the affliction here pure only if it had healed. And the definition of a “healed” affliction here, is the case where the afflicted house had [its impure stones removed.] been scraped and replastered, and [after this whole procedure,] the affliction did not recur. However, the case described in our verse [where the affliction neither disappeared nor increased in size], requires removal of the impure stones, scraping, replastering and a third week [of quarantine]. Thus, the following is how our verse is to be understood: “But if the priest comes [...] and comes [again] at the end of the second [week of quarantine], and beholds that the affliction did not increase in size, then the house must be plastered, a procedure which necessarily must also involve removal of impure stones and scraping. [Then]

רש"י

שׁוֹכֵב מְנִיחַ? תִּלְמוּד לומר: “יִכְבֵּס”, “יִכְבֵּס”, רָבָה. אִם כֵּן לָמָּה נֶאֱמַר: “אֲכַל וְשָׁכַב”? לְתַן שְׁעוֹר לְשׁוֹכֵב כְּדִי אֲכִילת פָּרִס: (מח) וְאִם בֹּא יָבֵא. לְסוּף שְׁבוּעַ שְׁנֵי: וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה לֹא פָשָׂה. מִקְרָא זֶה בֹּא לְלַמֵּד בְּעוֹמֵד בְּעֵינָיו בְּרֵאשׁוֹן וּבְשָׁנִי, מִה יַעֲשֶׂה לוֹ? יִכּוֹל, יִטְהַרְנוּ, כְּמִשְׁמַעוֹ שֶׁל מִקְרָא: “וְיִטְהַר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת הַבַּיִת?” תִּלְמוּד לומר: “כִּי נִרְפָּא הַנֶּגַע”, לֹא טְהַרְתִּי אֲלֵא אֶת הַרְפוּי, וְאִין רְפוּי אֲלֵא הַבַּיִת שֶׁהִקְצָה וְהוּטָה, וְלֹא חֹזֵר הַנֶּגַע, אֲבָל זֶה, טְעוֹן חֲלִיצָה וְקִצּוּי וְטִיחָה וְשְׁבוּעַ שְׁלִישִׁי. וְכֵן הַמִּקְרָא נִדְרָשׁ: “וְאִם בֹּא יָבֵא”, בְּשָׁנִי “וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה לֹא פָשָׂה”, יִטְהַרְנוּ, וְאִין טִיחָה בְּלֹא חֲלוּץ וְקִצּוּי; “וְאִחֲרֵי הַטּוּחַ אֶת הַבַּיִת וְיִטְהַר

וידכי כהנא ית ביתא ארי
אתסי מכתשא: מט ויסב
לדכאה ית ביתא תרתין צפרין
ואעא דארזא וצבע זהורי
ואזובא: נ ויכוס ית צפרא חדא
למאן דחסף על מי מבווע:
נא ויסב ית אעא דארזא וית
אזובא וית צבע זהורי וית
צפרא חיתא ויטבול יתהון
בדמא דצפרא דנכיסא ובמי
מבווע ונדי לביתא שבע זמנין:
נב וידכי ית ביתא בדמא
דצפרא ובמי מבווע ובצפרא
חיתא ובאעא דארזא ובאזובא
ובצבע זהורי:

אחרי הטח את הבית וטהר הפהן את-
הבית פי גרפא הנגע: מט ולקח לחטא
את הבית שתי צפרים ועץ ארז ושני
תולעת ואזב: נ ושחט את הצפור האחת
אל-כלי-חרש על-מים חיים: נא ולקח
את-עץ-הארז ואת-האזב ואת ו שני
התולעת ואת הצפור החיה וטבל אתם
בדם הצפור השחוטתה ובמים החיים והנה
אל-הבית שבע פעמים: נב וחטא את-
הבית בדם הצפור ובמים החיים ובצפור
החיה ובעץ הארז ובאזב ובשני התולעת:

will [pronounce] the house pure, because the affliction has healed. (49) To [ritually] cleanse the house, he must take two birds, cedar wood, a strip of crimson [wool] and hyssop. (50) He will slaughter one bird into an earthenware vessel, over fresh water. (51) And he will take the cedar wood, the hyssop, the strip of crimson [wool] and the live bird, and he should dip them in the blood of the bird that was slaughtered and in the fresh water and sprinkle towards the house seven times. (52) And he will [thus] cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, the fresh water, the live bird, the cedar wood, the hyssop and the strip of crimson [wool].

RASHI

after the house has been replastered, the priest will [pronounce] the house pure *if the affliction did not recur at the end of a week [of quarantine applied after the replastering],*

because the affliction has healed." *And in the case where the affliction does recur at that point, it has already been explained regarding a [house with a] recurring affliction [after removal of impure stones, scraping, replastering and a week of quarantine], that demolition is required.*

רש"י

הכהן את הבית, אם לא חזר לסוף השבוע, "כי גרפא הנגע", ואם חזר, כבר פרש על החזר, שטעון נתיצה: