

# III.

---

## BAVLI TRACTATE NAZIR CHAPTER THREE

### FOLIOS 16A-20B

3:1-4

3:1

- A. He who said, “Lo, I am a Nazirite,” cuts his hair on the thirty-first day.
- B. But if he cut it on the thirtieth day, he has fulfilled his obligation.
- C. [If he said,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite for thirty days,”
- D. if he cut his hair on the thirtieth day, he has not fulfilled his obligation.

3:2

- A. He who took a Nazirite vow for two spells cuts his hair for the first on the thirty-first day and for the second on the sixty-first day.
- B. And if he cut his hair for the first on the thirtieth day, he cuts his hair for the second on the sixtieth day.
- C. But if he cut his hair on the sixtieth day less one, he [nonetheless] has fulfilled his obligation.
- D. This testimony did R. Pappas present concerning one who took a vow to observe two spells as a Nazirite.
- E. If he cut his hair for the first spell on the thirtieth day, he cuts his hair for the second on the sixtieth
- F. But if he cut his hair for the second on the sixtieth day less one, he has fulfilled his obligation
- G. For the thirtieth day counts for him among the number [of days of the second Nazirite vow].

3:3

- A. He who said, “Lo, I am a Nazirite,”
- B. if he was made unclean on the thirtieth day,
- C. he loses the whole [thirty days he already has observed].
- D. R. Eliezer says, “He loses only seven days.”
- E. [If he said,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite for thirty [whole] days,” and was made unclean on the thirtieth day, he loses the whole [thirty days he already has observed].

### 3:4

- A. “Lo, I am a Nazirite for a hundred days,
  - B. if he was made unclean on the hundredth day,
  - C. he loses the whole [hundred days already observed].
  - D. R. Eliezer says, “He loses only thirty days.”
  - E. If he was made unclean on the hundred-and-first day, he loses thirty days.
  - F. R. Eliezer says, “He loses only seven days.”
- I.1** A. He who said, “Lo, I am a Nazirite,” if he was made unclean on the thirtieth day, he loses the whole [thirty days he already has observed]. R. Eliezer says, “He loses only seven days:”
- B. [16B] *R. Eliezer adopts the theory that any [uncleanness that is contracted] after the fulfillment causes the loss of only seven days.*
- II.1** A. [If he said,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite for thirty [whole] days,” and was made unclean on the thirtieth day, he loses the whole [thirty days he already has observed].
- B. *R. Eliezer does not take issue here, because he supposes that the man said, “whole days.”*
- III.1** A. “Lo, I am a Nazirite for a hundred days, if he was made unclean on the hundredth day, he loses the whole [hundred days already observed]. R. Eliezer says, “He loses only thirty days.”
- B. *The whole may be interpreted in line with the view of Bar Peda or of R. Matena [as noted above, [M. 1:3A I.1/5A-7A].*

### 3:5

- A. He who vowed to be a Nazirite while in a graveyard, even if he was there for thirty days — those days do not count for him toward the number [of days owing under the vow].
  - B. Nor does he bring an offering for his uncleanness [for being in the graveyard].
  - C. [If, however] he went out and then came back [into the graveyard], they do count for him toward the number [of required days].
  - D. And he does bring an offering for his uncleanness.
  - E. R. Eliezer says, “That is not the case if it is on the very same day, since it says, ‘But the former days shall be void’ (Num. 6:12) — [the offering for uncleanness is brought] only when the former days apply to him.”
- I.1** A. *It has been stated:*
- B. He who vowed to be a Nazirite while in a graveyard —
- C. R. Yohanan said, “The vow of Naziriteship takes effect on him.”
- D. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “The vow of Naziriteship does not take effect on him.”
- E. R. Yohanan said, “The vow of Naziriteship takes effect on him.” *he takes the view that the matter is suspended and ready for action, and once he becomes cultically clean, the matter takes effect.*

- F. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “The vow of Naziriteship does not take effect on him.” *if he goes and restates the oath [in a condition of cleanness], it will take effect, but if not, not.*
- G. *Objected R. Yohanan to R. Simeon b. Laqish, “He who vowed to be a Nazirite while in a graveyard, even if he was there for thirty days — those days do not count for him toward the number [of days owing under the vow]. Nor does he bring an offering for his uncleanness [for being in the graveyard]. It is the offering for his uncleanness [in particular] that he does not have to bring, but the vow takes effect on him!”*
- H. He said to him, “He does not fall under the very Torah of uncleanness, nor does he fall under the Torah of the offering, [but is totally outside the affects of the vow].”
- I. *An objection was raised: He who was unclean and took an oath as a Nazir is prohibited from cutting his hair and from drinking wine and from contracting corpse-uncleanness. And if he cut his hair, drank wine, or contracted corpse-uncleanness, he receives forty stripes [T. 2:14A-B]. Now, to be sure, if you say that the vow has taken effect over him, then we have the reason that he is flogged with forty stripes. But if you say that the vow has not taken effect over him, then why in the world should he be flogged at all?*
- J. **[17A]** *Here with what situation do we deal? With someone who was going out and then coming back in to the grave-area.*
- K. *An objection was raised: There is no difference between a person who was unclean and took a vow as a Nazirite and a Nazirite who is cultically clean but then contracted corpse-uncleanness, except that in the case of one who was unclean and took a Nazirite vow, the seventh day of his purification rite counts for him as part of the period as a Nazirite, while the person who was clean and took a Nazirite vow and then contracted corpse-uncleanness does not count the seventh day of his purification process as part of his Nazirite-period. Now, to be sure, if you say that the vow has not taken effect over him, then why in the world does it count for him as part of the days of his Nazirite vow?*
- L. *Said Mar b. Rab Ashi, “As to the vow’s taking effect, all parties concur that it does take effect. Where they differ, it has to do with the flogging. R. Yohanan takes the view that since the vow takes effect, he is flogged under the specified circumstances, and R. Simeon b. Laqish takes the position that he is not flogged, though the vow takes effect.”*
- M. *Objected R. Yohanan to R. Simeon b. Laqish, “He who vowed to be a Nazirite while in a graveyard, even if he was there for thirty days — those days do not count for him toward the number [of days owing under the vow]. Nor does he bring an offering for his uncleanness [for being in the graveyard]. It is the offering for his uncleanness that he does not have to bring, but the vow takes effect on him!”*
- N. *In strict logic, the Tannaite formulation should have added, He is not flogged, but because the framer of the Tannaite passage wished to add at the end, [If, however] he went out and then came back [into the graveyard], they do count for him toward the number [of required days]. And he does bring an offering for his uncleanness, he formulated*

*the Tannaite rule of the opening clause too, **Nor does he bring an offering for his uncleanness [for being in the graveyard].***

- O. *Come and take note:* There is no difference between a person who was unclean and took a vow as a Nazirite and a Nazirite who is cultically clean but then contracted corpse-uncleanness, except that in the case of one who was unclean and took a Nazirite vow, the seventh day of his purification rite counts for him as part of the period as a Nazirite, while the person who was clean and took a Nazirite vow and then contracted corpse-uncleanness does not count the seventh day of his purification process as part of his Nazirite-period. *Now, therefore, when it comes to a flogging, this and that are identical!*
- P. No. When it comes to getting a haircut, this and that are identical, but when it comes to a flogging, *what is the rule?* This one is flogged, but that one is not flogged.
- Q. *Then let the Tannaite rule mention that fact!*
- R. *The rule deals with the man's remedy, but it does not deal with the man's possibilities of fouling up!* [When the man commences the spell as a Nazirite, he is told "what is serviceable to him, not what is to his detriment" (Klien)].
- S. *Come and take note:* **He who was unclean and took an oath as a Nazir is prohibited from cutting his hair and from drinking wine and from contracting corpse-uncleanness. And if he cut his hair, drank wine, or contracted corpse-uncleanness, he receives forty stripes [T. 2:14A-B].**
- T. *That is a final refutation.*

- I.2 A.** *Raba raised this question: "A person who took the oath as a Nazirite while located in a cemetery, what is the law as to having to remain in the graveyard for an effective amount of time to be liable to a flogging? Does he or does he not [have to remain a specified span of time to incur liability]?"*
- B. *What are the facts of the case? Should I say that people say to him, "Don't take the Nazirite vow [standing where you are]!" then why should the consideration of his remaining there for a specified amount of time to incur liability to a flogging even arise? Why should there be no such requirement for an ordinary, [otherwise cultically clean] Nazirite to remain in a graveyard to incur liability to flogging? [That requirement is null] when people warn him about what he is doing [and if ignores the warning, he incurs liability to a flogging forthwith]. Here too, it is a case of peoples' warning him not to do what he is doing [so no such consideration of a minimum span of time can arise].*
- C. **[17B]** *Rather, we deal with a case in which the man has entered the grave area [protected from the corpse contamination by reason of being carried in a sealed] box, chest, or armoire, and [there he took the Nazirite vow], and then his fellow came along and removed the covering [now rendering him accessible to the uncleanness of the grave area]. Now here is the question: where we require a specified span of time for liability to be incurred, is that only in the house of the sanctuary [where one is liable to penalty for uncleanness in the sanctuary only if*

*he remains long enough to prostrate himself], but outside of the house of the sanctuary that is not the case? Or perhaps there is no difference?*

D. *That question stands.*

**I.3 A.** *R. Ashi raised the question, “If one took the vow of the Nazirite while located in a graveyard, is he required to shave the hair or not? When one requires a haircut, that is in the case of a clean person who has contracted corpse uncleanness, in which case he has rendered his Naziriteship unclean, but an unclean person who has taken the vow of the Nazirite does not. Or perhaps there is no difference?”*

B. *Come and take note: He who vowed to be a Nazirite while in a graveyard, even if he was there for thirty days — those days do not count for him toward the number [of days owing under the vow]. Nor does he bring an offering for his uncleanness [for being in the graveyard]. It is the offering for his uncleanness that he does not have to bring, but he does have to get a haircut?*

C. *[Not at all,] the sense is, what is the reason for something? That is, what is the reason he need not present the offering for contracting uncleanness? It is that the hair cut is not necessary. [So that does not settle the question.]*

D. *Come and take note: There is no difference between a person who was unclean and took a vow as a Nazirite and a Nazirite who is cultically clean but then contracted corpse-uncleanness, except that in the case of one who was unclean and took a Nazirite vow, the seventh day of his purification rite counts for him as part of the period as a Nazirite, while the person who was clean and took a Nazirite vow and then contracted corpse-uncleanness does not count the seventh day of his purification process as part of his Nazirite-period. Now does this not bear the implication, so far as a haircut goes, this one and that one are the same?*

E. *No, this one is subject to a flogging and so is that one, but as to the hair cut, what is the rule? This one gets the hair cut and that one does not get the hair cut.*

F. *So why not say so in the Tannaite formulation of the rule?*

G. *The Tannaite formulation states, “the seventh day” — and everything depending on it [the seventh day is counted as part of his Naziriteship because he does not need to bring a sacrifice and he does not bring a sacrifice because he does not cut the hair (Klien)].*

H. *Come and take note: [With reference to the situation of the person afflicted with the skin-ailment of Lev. 13], I know only concerning the days that he is unclean [with corpse uncleanness] that they do not count in the period of his Naziriteship. How do I know that the same is true of the days during which he is definitively unclean with the skin-ailment itself? It is a matter of logic. If during the days during which he is unclean he cuts his hair and presents a hair-offering, also during the days on which he is definitively unclean with the skin ailment, he ought to be able to cut his hair and present the offering. And just as the days in which he is unclean do not count for him toward the days of fulfilling his Nazirite vow, so the days on which he is definitively unclean with the skin-ailment should not count for him in the number of days of fulfilling his vow. [Not at all]. If you take that view of the days in which he is unclean, which nullify the days already observed [so that they do not count toward the days of fulfilling his vow], and therefore they also do*

not count for him toward the days of fulfilling his vow, will you say the same of the days during which he is definitively unclean with the skin ailment, which do not invalidate the days already observed, and therefore they ought to count for him toward the fulfillment of the days of his Nazirite vow.

- J. Say as follows: if for the Nazirite who has taken his vow while in a graveyard, whose hair is suitable for cutting, the days do not count toward the number required to fulfill his Nazirite vow, the days during which he is definitively unclean with the skin ailment, during which his hair is not suitable for cutting, all the more so should it be the fact that those days do not count toward the fulfillment of his Nazirite vow! [Sifré to Numbers XXXI:III to Num. 6:12]. *Now is not what is at stake* a cutting of the hair as a result of his contracting uncleanness? [“Whose hair is suitable for cutting” means, he must cut the hair as a result of his defilement in the graveyard, so Ashi’s question, A, is answered in the affirmative (Klien)]?
- K. No, what is at issue is the hair cutting after keeping in a state of cleanness the requisite number of days in fulfillment of the Nazirite vow. [Klien: so that the argument is, seeing that a Nazirite who takes a vow in the graveyard, whose hair will be ripe for cutting after he has purified himself and observed the period of his Naziriteship, does not count the days, surely the person with the skin ailment, whose hair is not ripe for cutting as part of his Naziriteship because he has to cut on recover from the ailment before he starts to count the Naziriteship, ought not to count the days, etc.] *And that stands to reason, [18A] for if it should enter your mind that it is a haircut as a result of uncleanness, doesn’t he have to take a haircut after the period in which he is definitively unclean with the skin ailment?* [The two cases are analogous, and we cannot call one suitable for the haircut and the other not (Klien).]
- L. *Not at all. The allusion to the haircut is, the haircut on account of the Nazirite vow [the unclean Nazirite has to cut his hair because he is a Nazirite, but the person with the skin ailment cuts his hair because he was afflicted with the skin ailment].*
- M. *Come and take note: “[And if any man dies very suddenly beside him,] and he defiles his consecrated head, [then he shall shave his head on the day of his cleansing, on the seventh day he shall shave it]” (Num. 6: 9): Scripture speaks of one who had been clean and then was made unclean. Lo, such a one is liable for the removal of the hair and the bringing of the offering. And the passage further serves to exempt [from the stated procedure] one who took the oath of a Nazirite while in a cemetery [where by definition he is unclean with corpse uncleanness. Such a one does not have to undergo the rite of purification]. For the contrary view might have emerged from mere logic: If one who had been clean and then was made unclean is liable for the removal of the hair and the bringing of the purification offering, one who [at the moment of taking the Nazirite oath] to begin with was unclean surely should be liable for the removal of the hair and the bring of the offering. Accordingly, it is Scripture that is required to state matters correctly, specifically, “[And if any man dies very suddenly beside him,] and he defiles his consecrated head, [then he shall shave his head on the day of his*



cleansing, on the seventh day he shall shave it]" (Num. 6: 9): Scripture speaks of one who had been clean and then was made unclean. Lo, such a one is liable for the removal of the hair and the bringing of the offering, and the passage further serves to exempt one who took the oath of a Nazirite in a cemetery [Sifré to Numbers XXXVIII:III]. *That proves that the one who vowed to become a Nazirite while in a graveyard [is exempt].*

- I.4 A.** *Who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* There is no difference between a person who was unclean and took a vow as a Nazirite and a Nazirite who is cultically clean but then contracted corpse-uncleanness, except that in the case of one who was unclean and took a Nazirite vow, the seventh day of his purification rite counts for him as part of the period as a Nazirite, while the person who was clean and took a Nazirite vow and then contracted corpse-uncleanness does not count the seventh day of his purification process as part of his Nazirite-period?
- B. *Said R. Hisda, "It is Rabbi, for Rabbi has said, 'The Naziriteship [after the person has contracted uncleanness] does not begin again [to count toward fulfillment of the vow] until the eighth day of purification.' For should you say it is R. Yosé b. R. Judah, has he not said, 'The Naziriteship after the person has contracted uncleanness counts once more on the seventh day of purification'?"*
- C. *Where do we find the positions of Rabbi and of R. Yosé b. R. Judah?*
- D. *It is as we have learned on Tannaite authority:*
- E. "And he shall sanctify his head that same day" (Num. 6:11)
- 
- F. "On the day that he brings his offerings [the eighth day]," the words of Rabbi.
- G. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, "On the day of his hair cutting [the seventh day after contracting uncleanness]."
- H. *And who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for that which we have learned in the Mishnah: **These bring a single offering for many transgressions: (1) He who has sexual relations with a bondwoman many times, and (2) a Nazirite who is made unclean many times [M. Ker. 2:3A-C].***
- I. *Said R. Hisda, "It is R. Yosé b. R. Judah, who has said, 'The Nazirite vow after the Nazirite has contracted uncleanness starts once more on the seventh day of purification.'*
- J. *"And you would find such a situation, for example, in a case in which the Nazirite contracted uncleanness on the seventh day of purification and the same thing happened again on the seventh day thereafter; now, since there was not a single moment that was suitable for his presenting an offering, he is liable for only a single offering. Now if you should say that it represents the view of Rabbi, then if you have a case in which the Nazirite contracted*

uncleanness on the seventh day of purification and the same thing happened again on the seventh day thereafter, *these all represent a single protracted spell of uncleanness. And if you suppose you have a case in which the Nazirite contracted uncleanness on the eighth day of purification and the same thing happened again on the eighth day thereafter, lo, there was a moment in each spell on which he could present his offering.*”

K. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of Rabbi?*

L. Said Scripture, “And make atonement for him that he sinned by reason of the dead” (Num. 6:11) and then, “And he shall sanctify his head” (Num. 6:11). [The Naziriteship therefore commences once more after the offering of the sacrifice, which is on the eighth day.]

M. And R. Yosé b. R. Judah?

N. *If that were the correct reading of the matter, then Scripture should read, “And he shall sanctify his head” [and stop] — [18B] for what need do we have for “on that day”? Since it cannot refer to the eighth day [being superfluous in context], we may assume it speaks of the seventh day.*

O. *And Rabbi — from his perspective, does Scripture not refer to “that day”?*

P. *Rabbi will say to you, “‘That day’ is introduced for hit purpose, to state, even if the Nazirite does not present the required sacrifices, nonetheless, the Naziriteship recommences.”*

Q. *Now what made it necessary for R. Hisda to choose R. Yosé b. R. Judah for the authority behind the rule at hand? He could as well have chosen to interpret the saying to speak of a case where the Nazirite contracted uncleanness on the eighth night preceding the eighth day] and have assigned the authorship to Rabbi [Klien: so that the defilements are separate, though in regard to sacrifices they would be considered one, seeing that no sacrifice can be brought at night]? Since he does not propose to demonstrate that the statement derives from the principle of Rabbi, may we say that [Hisda] takes the view that the night before the day on which the sacrifice is due is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period [although the offering is brought only on the next day]?*

R. *Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “The one thing depends on the other. If you take the position that the night before the day that the sacrifice is owing is deemed to belong to the preceding period, then, since he can present his sacrifice only in the morning, the*



*Nazirite vow does not go into effect until the morning [so we have one protracted period of uncleanness], but if the night prior to the day on which the offering is owing is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period, then the Nazirite vow after purification begins in the evening [and Rabbi would want an offering for each event of uncleanness].”*

**I.5 A.** [Deleting: reverting to the body of the preceding discussion:] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. 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.
- C. 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.”
- D. R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b Beroqah says, “Just as his sin-offering [if not offered] stands in the way of his counting the days of his new Naziriteship, so does his guilt-offering.”
  - E. *Now there is no problem understanding the position of R. Eliezer, for Scripture has said, “And he shall sanctify his head on that same day” (Num. 6:11) — that is so*

even though he has not yet presented his offerings. And Rabbis [explain] “that day” to mean, even though he has not presented his guilt-offering. *But how does R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqa explain “that day”?*

F. He will say to you, “That means, even though he has not presented his whole-offering.”

G. And rabbis?

H. *An exclusionary phrase is not required for the whole offering [to dispense with the burnt offering], since it is presented merely as a gift in general [but does not effect atonement].*

I. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of rabbis [in holding that the guilt offering is not indispensable to the counting of the days of the new Naziriteship]?*

J. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

K. **“And he shall consecrated to the Lord the days of his Naziriteship and shall bring a he-lamb of the first year for a guilt-offering” (Num. 6:12) — Why does Scripture make such a statement? Since we find that all other guilt-offerings mentioned in the Torah are essential to the atonement rite [until they are presented], one might have thought that this one too is essential to the rite. [19A] Scripture therefore states, “And he shall consecrated to the Lord the days of his Naziriteship and shall bring a he-lamb of the first year for a guilt-offering” (Num. 6:12) — even though he has not yet presented the offering, he shall consecrate... R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, ““And**

**he shall consecrate and he shall bring' — when does he consecrated? When he has brought [the required offering]" [Sif. to Num. XXI:I].**

L. *Who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for that which our rabbis have taught:*

M. A woman who took the vow of a Nazirite and contracted corpse uncleanness, and then her husband nullified her vow, has nonetheless to bring a sin-offering of a bird, but not the burnt-offering of a bird.

N. Said R. Hisda, "It is R. Ishmael."

O. *What is [R. Hisda's] theory of this matter? If he takes the view that the husband utterly uproots the oath [as though it had never been valid], then the wife should also not have to present a sin-offering of fowl. If he takes the view that the husband's power is only to bring the vow to an end, then she also should have to present the burnt offering of fowl!*

P. *In point of fact, he takes the view that the husband uproots the oath as though it had never taken place, and R. Ishmael takes the view of R. Eleazar Haqqappar, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

Q. R. Eleazar Haqqappar beRibbi says, "Why does Scripture say, 'And make atonement for him for he has sinned against the soul'

(Num. 6:11) — against what soul has this one sinned? But he has caused himself distress by not drinking wine. And it yields an argument a fortiori: if this one, who has caused himself distress merely by not drinking wine, is called a sinner, he who causes himself distress by not benefiting from any [of this world's goods] — all the more so!”

R. *Now this verse is written with reference to a Nazirite who has contracted corpse uncleanness — and we are speaking of a Nazirite who is clean and has not contracted corpse uncleanness!*

S. R. *Eleazar Haqqappar takes the view that the Nazirite who has not contracted corpse uncleanness also is called a sinner, and here is the reason that the verse is written with reference to a Nazirite who has contracted corpse uncleanness? It is because he repeats his sin [losing the period before contracting corpse uncleanness, and he now has to start counting thirty days once again].*

**II.1 A. [If, however] he went out and then came back [into the graveyard], they do count for him toward the number [of required days]:**

- B. *The Tannaite rule then is, they do count for him toward the number [of required days].* It is because he has left the graveyard that the Nazirite vow takes effect on him?
- C. Said Samuel, “It is a case in which he has left the grave area, been sprinkled once and then a second time, and immersed.” [He is now pure, so the vow applies.]
- D. Then if he reenters, the days count, but if he does not enter the area, they don’t count?

- E. *The argument is framed as, not only this but also that, in the following way: it is not a question that if he went out [the vow takes effect and the days count], but even if he entered the grave area, they count.*
- F. *Said R. Kahana and R. Assi to Rab, "How come you didn't explain the passage to us along these lines?"*
- G. *He said to them, "I supposed that you did not have to be told [since it is self-evident]."*

**III.1 A. R. Eliezer says, "That is not the case if it is on the very same day, since it says, 'But the former days shall be void' (Num. 6:12) — [the offering for uncleanness is brought] only when the former days apply to him:"**

- B. *Said Ulla, "R. Eliezer made this statement only with reference to an unclean person who took the Nazirite vow, but as to a clean Nazirite who contracted uncleanness, his Naziriteship is void even on the first day [there are no 'former days']."*
- C. **[19B]** *Said Raba, "What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Eliezer? Said Scripture, 'Because his vow of Naziriteship has been made unclean' (Num. 6:12) — that is, because he undertook the Nazirite vow during his period of uncleanness."*
- D. *Objected Abbaye, "'Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for a hundred days,' and he contracts uncleanness on the first of the hundred days, might one suppose that that fact invalidates the Naziriteship? Scripture says, 'But the former days shall be void' (Num. 6:12) — there have to be 'former days,' but here there is none. Might one suppose that if he contracted uncleanness at the end of the hundred days, this would invalidate the Naziriteship? Scripture says, 'But the former days shall be void,' bearing the implication that there are latter days, but in this case, there are no latter days. If he contracted uncleanness on the ninety-ninth day, one might suppose that he would not invalidate the Naziriteship. Scripture states, 'But the former days shall be void,' bearing the implication, there must be days to come, and in this case, there are former days and latter days. Lo, you cannot say that Scripture speaks of an unclean person who has taken the Nazirite vow, since the critical language is, 'Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for a hundred days,' and he contracts uncleanness on the first of the hundred days, — and yet the passage bears the clear statement that former days are necessary. This then refutes the proposal of Ulla."*
- E. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, "As to these 'days' of which we speak, is it a case that if one has passed and the man contracts uncleanness when the second begins, or must two pass, with the uncleanness contracted when the third has begun?"*
- F. *He had nothing on that matter, so he went and asked Raba, who said, "'They shall fall away' is what Scripture states [thus meaning, two complete days]."*
- G. *And it was necessary for Scripture to state, "days," and it was necessary for Scripture to use the plural, "They shall fall away." For had Scripture written, "days," but not written, "They shall fall away," I might have supposed that it suffices if one day has passed and the second has just begun [part of the day being equivalent to the whole], so Scripture said, "They shall fall away." And if Scripture had said, "They shall fall away," but not said, "days," I might have supposed that even one day suffices. So Scripture had to say, "days."*

- A. He who [while overseas] took a vow to be a Nazirite for a long spell and completed his spell as a Nazirite, and afterward came to the Land [of Israel]
- 
- B. the House of Shammai say, “He is a Nazirite for thirty days.”
- E. And the House of Hillel say, “He is a Nazirite as from the very beginning.”
- D. M’S H B: Helene the queen — her son went off to war, and she said, “If my son comes home from war whole and in one piece, I shall be a Nazirite for seven years.” Indeed her son did come home from war, and she was a Nazirite for seven years. Then at the end of the seven years, she went up to the Land. The House of Hillel instructed her that she should be a Nazirite for another seven years. Then at the end of seven years she was made unclean. So she turned out to be a Nazirite for twenty-one years.
- E. Said R. Judah, “She was a Nazirite only fourteen years.”
- I.1** A. *The opening clause states as the Tannaite formulation, the House of Shammai say, “He is a Nazirite for thirty days.’ And the House of Hillel say, “He is a Nazirite as from the very beginning.” May one then suppose that this is what is at issue between them: The House of Shammai take the view that the sages declared the land of the gentiles to be unclean as to their soil, [20A] while the House of Hillel held that it was also on account of the air? [That would yield the more stringent ruling of the House of Hillel.]*
- B. *Not at all. All parties concur that it was because of the soil alone that sages made their decree of uncleanness, and the House of Shammai take the view that in the case of a Nazirite vow of an ordinary character we impose a penalty [for contracting uncleanness even from a source of uncleanness not explicitly stated in the Torah], while the House of Hillel maintain that, where we impose a penalty, it is at the outset of the Naziriteship [and it actually commences only upon arrival in the Land].*
- II.1** A. M’S H B: Helene the queen — her son went off to war, and she said, “If my son comes home from war whole and in one piece, I shall be a Nazirite for seven years.” Indeed her son did come home from war, and she was a Nazirite for seven years. Then at the end of the seven years, she went up to the Land. The House of Hillel instructed her that she should be a Nazirite for another seven years. Then at the end of seven years she was made unclean. So she turned out to be a Nazirite for twenty-one years. Said R. Judah, “She was a Nazirite only fourteen years.”
- B. *The question was raised: is she assumed by R. Judah to have contracted uncleanness, so he agrees with the position of the House of Shammai, or perhaps his ruling concerned her not having contracted uncleanness, and it was spelled out in line with the position of the House of Hillel?*
- C. *Come and take note: she went up to the Land. The House of Hillel instructed her that she should be a Nazirite for another seven years. Now, if you should suppose that it was a case of her having contracted uncleanness and the report [of R. Judah] is set forth within the premise of the House of Shammai, if so, the*



*formulation should not have been, Said R. Judah, “She was a Nazirite only fourteen years.” What is required is, “Fourteen years and thirty days.”*

- D. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. R. Judah says in the name of R. Eliezer, “Said Scripture, ‘And this is the law of the Nazirite on the day when the days of his separation are fulfilled’ (Num. 6:13) — the Torah has said that, if he contracts uncleanness on the day of his fulfillment, he is subject to the Torah of the Nazirite.” [Klien: the implication is that Judah does require the Nazirite who becomes defiled in his last day to observe thirty more days, so we are entitled to make an inference from the brief form, “fourteen years” as is done in the text.]

### 3:7

- A. **He concerning whom two groups of witnesses gave testimony —**
- B. **these testify that he took a vow to be a Nazirite for two spells,**
- C. **and these testify that he took a vow to be a Nazirite for five spells**
- D. **the House of Shammai say, “The testimony is at variance, and no Naziriteship applies here at all.”**
- E. **And the House of Hillel say, “In the sum of five are two spells. So let him serve out two spells of Naziriteship.”**

**I.1** A. *Our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with the following Tannaite authority, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not differ concerning a case in which there were two sets of witnesses giving testimony concerning him, one saying it was for two spells, and one saying it was five, that because in the sum of five are two spells, he is a Nazir for the shortest period [specified in their joint testimony]. Concerning what sort of case did they differ? Concerning a case in which there was a single set of witnesses, thus there were two individual witnesses giving testimony concerning him. The one says he took a vow for two spells, and the other, for five. For: The House of Shammai say, ‘The testimony is divided, [so that there is no obligation to be a Nazir here at all].’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘In the sum of five are two spells. So let him serve out two spells of Naziriteship’” [M. Naz. 3:7] [T. 3:1].*

- I.2** A. Said Rab, “All concur that where the witnesses enumerate, [the evidence is conflicting].”
- B. *Said R. Hama to R. Hisda, “What’s the point of his statement? Should I say, one says five and not two, and the other says, two and not five? Lo, they are contradicting one another. Rather, it must be a case in which one says one, and then a second time, and the other says, a third, a fourth, and a fifth [time he took the vow].”*
  - C. **[20B]** *Lo, what do I need the second to repeat the first two [even with enumeration there is still no conflict (Klien)]. Since the second witness testifies to the more strict outcome, he surely testifies to the less strict outcome?*
    - D. In the West they say, “Where there is enumeration, there is no consideration of contradictory testimony.” [Klien: he is therefore required

to observe two Naziriteships, Rab's opinion is wrong; the second witness does not contradict the first, and there are then two witnesses to the fact that he vowed two spells as a Nazirite.]