

I.

BAVLI TRACTATE NAZIR CHAPTER ONE

FOLIOS 2A-8B

1:1

- A. All euphemisms for [the form of words for] a Nazirite vow are equivalent to a Nazirite vow [and binding].
- B. He who says, “I will be [such]” — lo, this one is a Nazirite.
- C. Or: “I shall be comely” — he is a Nazirite.
- D. [If he says,] “Naziq “ or “Naziah “ or “Paziah “ — lo, this one is a Nazirite.
- E. [If he says,] “Lo, I shall be like this one,” “Lo, I shall curl [my hair],” “Lo, I shall tend [my hair],” “Lo, it is incumbent on me to grow [my hair] long” — lo, this one is a Nazirite.
- F. [If he says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to offer] birds” —
- G. R. Meir says, “He is a Nazirite.”
- H. And sages say, “He is not a Nazirite.”

- I.1 A. *Since the Tannaite author deals with the division of Women, how come he repeats tractate Nazir [preliminary to tractate Sotah] where he does?*
- B. *The Tannaite authority builds upon the verse of Scripture, “Then if it happens that she has found no favor in his eyes because he has found some unseemly thing in her” (Deu. 24: 1) — and here is his theory of matters: what has caused her transgression? It was wine. So this is the sense of his statement: Whoever witnesses the disgrace of the wife accused of unfaithfulness will take a vow against drinking wine.*
- I.2 A. The Tannaite framer of the law commences with euphemisms and exemplifies with cases of allusions! [There is a disjuncture here.]
- B. *Said Raba, and some say, Kadi, “There is a flaw in the formulation of the rule, and here is the sense of the Tannaite law: **All euphemisms for Nazirite vows are equivalent to Nazirite vows**, and all allusions to Nazirite vows are equivalent to Nazirite vows. And what are allusions to Nazirite vows? **He who says, “I will be [such]”— lo, this one is a Nazirite.**”*
- C. *Well, then, why not explain euphemisms first of all?*

- D. *The topic from which the basic formulation concludes is the one that is explained first of all [and then the framer circles back and addresses the other, as in the following case,] which we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- E. **With what do they kindle [the Sabbath light] and with what do they not kindle it?** *And then the Tannaite authority spells out the matter: They do not kindle with (1) cedar fiber, (2) uncarded flax, (3) raw silk, (4) wick of bast, (5) wick of the desert, (6) or seaweed; or with (1) pitch, (2) wax, (3) castor oil, (4) oil [given to a priest as heave-offering which had become unclean and must therefore be] burned, (5) [grease from] the fat tail, or (6) tallow [M. Shab. 2:1A-C].*
- F. **With what do they cover [up food to keep it hot], and with what do they not cover up [food to keep it hot]?** *And then the Tannaite authority spells out the matter: They do not cover with (1) peat, (2) compost, (3) salt, (4) lime, or (5) sand, whether wet or dry or with (6) straw, (7) grape skins, (8) flocking [rags], or (9) grass, when wet. But they do cover up [food to keep it hot] with them when they are dry. They cover up [food to keep it hot] with (1) cloth, (2) produce, (3) the wings of a dove, (4) carpenters' sawdust, and (5) soft hackled flax [M. Shab. 4:1A-H].*
- G. **With what does a woman go out, and with what does she not go out?** *And then the Tannaite authority spells out the matter: A woman should not go out with (1) woolen ribbons, (2) flaxen ribbons, or (3) with bands around her head... [M. Shab. 6:1A-C].*
- H. *So is it the fact that the opening clause of a composite statement is never explained first of all? And have we not learned in the Mishnah [numerous contrary usages, such as these:]*
- I. **With what does a beast (Exo. 20:10) go out [on the Sabbath], and with what does it not go out?** *And then the Tannaite authority spells out the matter: (1) A camel goes out with its curb, (2) a female camel with its nose ring, (3) a Libyan ass with its bridle, (4) and a horse with its chain. And all beasts which wear a chain go out with a chain and are led by a chain, and they sprinkle on the [chains if they become unclean] and immerse them in place [without removing them] [M. Shab. 5:1A-C].*
- J. **There are those who inherit and bequeath, there are those who inherit but do not bequeath, bequeath but do not inherit, do not inherit and do not bequeath.** *And then the Tannaite authority spells out the matter: These inherit and bequeath... [M. B.B. 8:1A-B].*
- K. *But in point of fact the Tannaite framer of a passage may formulate matters in the one way, and he may formulate them in the other way. But there [in the first set of cases], because what is involved is a prohibition that applies to the person, he first of all spells out prohibitions that apply to the person. When it comes to the matter of the beast, since the prohibition comes in the matter of the beast, he spells out what is permitted first of all. [2B] As to the matter of inheritances, the Tannaite formulation commences with the principal type of inheritance first of all.*

- L. *[So what's the point?!] In the case at hand, why not spell out euphemisms first of all?*
- M. *But this is the operative consideration: because the rule covering euphemisms derives from an exegesis of the Torah, it was preferable to him to commence [his amplification] with them.*
- N. *Then why not begin with them!*
- O. *When the Tannaite authority commences the exposition, he commences with the "qorban-vow" [=the basic type of vow, the essential forms, thus the euphemisms; allusions are subsidiary]. But when it comes to amplify the matter, he amplifies with the matter of allusions first of all.*

II.1 A. He who says, "I will be [such]" — lo, this one is a Nazirite:

- B. *Maybe when he says, "I will be," he made reference to observing a fast day?*
- C. *Said Samuel, "We deal with a case in which a Nazirite was walking by [who thereby defined the circumstances of the man's statement]."*
- D. *May one then propose that Samuel takes the view, "Inexplicit abbreviations are null [and take effect only if they are made explicit]"? [But we know that he takes the opposite position!]*
- E. *Say: in a case in which a Nazirite was walking by, there are no grounds for doubt in confusing the man's intent for some other matter, but certainly in a case in which a Nazirite was not walking by, we rule, perhaps when he said, "I will be," he did indeed have in mind undertaking a fast.*
- F. *But maybe the man's intent was to convey the pledge to free the other [the passing Nazirite] from the cost of his sacrifices [and to say,] "I shall be [in his place to provide his offerings as a Nazirite]"?*
- G. *The statement was made in his heart [and not explicitly].*
- H. *If so, what's the point [of course he becomes a Nazirite]!*
- I. *What might you otherwise have supposed? We require that what he says and what he thinks in his heart must match. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

III.1 A. Or: "I shall be comely" — he is a Nazirite:

- B. *Maybe when he says, "I shall be comely," what he means is, "I shall be comely before him in the performance of religious duties"?*
- C. *That would accord with what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *"This is my God and I will adorn him" (Exo. 15: 2) — adorn yourself before him by truly elegant fulfillment of the religious duties, for example: A beautiful tabernacle, a beautiful palm branch, a beautiful ram's horn, beautiful show fringes, a beautiful scroll of the Torah, written in fine ink, with a fine reed, by a skilled penman, wrapped with beautiful silks.*
- E. *Said Samuel, "We deal with a case in which he was holding his hair in his hand when he says, 'I shall be comely.'"*

III.2 A. But taking the Nazirite vow is a matter of transgression, and here it is called "comely"?!

- B. **[3A]** *Indeed, for even in the view of R. Eleazar Haqqappar, who has said, “The Nazirite is a sinner,” that opinion pertains to a Nazirite who contracts uncleanness, for, because he loses the valid days already observed — for the All-Merciful has said, “But the former days shall be void because his consecration was defiled” (Num. 6:12) — he may well turn out to give up and to violate his Nazirite vow altogether. But in the case of a Nazirite who has not contracted uncleanness, he is not called a sinner.*

IV.1 A. [If he says,] “Lo, I shall be like this one:”

- B. *While he is holding on to his hair, he has not said, “I intend to be through this” [but only “like” this]!*
- C. *Said Samuel, “We deal with a case in which a Nazirite was walking by [who thereby defined the circumstances of the man’s statement].”*

V.1 A. “Lo, I shall curl [my hair]:”

- B. *How do we know that this word that is used means “curl the hair”?*
- C. *It is in line with what a certain serving girl of the household of Rabbi said to a certain man, “How long are you going to curl [using the same word] your hair?”*
- D. *Maybe the usage is as in the Torah in the verse where the same root occurs, “Extol [using the same root] her and she will exalt you” (Pro. 4: 8)?*
- E. *Said Samuel, “Here too we deal with a case in which he was holding his hair in his hand when he says, ‘I shall curl....’”*

VI.1 A. “Lo, I shall tend [my hair]:”

- B. *How do we know that this word that is used means “tend the hair”?*
- C. *It is in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: ...**quicklime — enough to smear the little finger of a girl. R. Judah says, “Enough to take off the hair [using the word at hand]” [M. Shab. 8:4C-D]. And said Rab, “This means the hair of one of the temples.”***
- D. *But maybe it means, take care of the poor, following the usage is as in the Torah in the verse where the same root occurs, “And Joseph sustained his father and his brothers” (Gen. 47:12)?*
- E. *Said Samuel, “Here too we deal with a case in which he was holding his hair in his hand.”*

VII.1 A. “Lo, it is incumbent on me to grow [my hair] long:”

- B. *How do we know that this word translated “to grow long” refers to increasing the hair?*
- C. *It is in line with that which is written, “Your shoots [using the same root] are a park of pomegranates” (Son. †4:13).*
- D. *Might I say that it means “removal” as in the verse, “And sends waters upon the fields” (Job. 5:10)?*
- E. *The Tannaite authority draws a verbal analogy based on the occurrence of the same root in two verses, as follows: “He shall be holy, he shall let the locks grow long” (Num. 6: 5) and “Nor permit their locks to grow long” (Eze. 44:20).*

- F. *And if you prefer, I shall say, when the root is used in the setting of water [as at Job. 5:10], it also means, increase, for when they water the produce, it also shoots up.”*

VIII.1 A. [If he says,] “Lo, I pledge myself [to offer] birds” — R. Meir says, “He is a Nazirite.” And sages say, “He is not a Nazirite:”

- B. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Meir?*
- C. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “‘Birds are joined with hair, in the verse in which it is written, ‘til his hair had grown long like eagles’ feathers and his nails like birds’ claws’ (Dan. 4:30). *R. Meir takes the view that, when one refers to something, he may mean something else that occurs in the same context.* [3B] *And rabbis take the view that, when one refers to something, he does not mean something else that occurs in the same context.”*
- E. *R. Yohanan said, “All parties concur that when one refers to something, he does not mean something else that occurs in the same context. But this is the operative consideration behind the ruling of R. Meir: We take account of the possibility that, in making his statement, the man has undertaken responsibility to provide the bird-offering of an unclean Nazirite.”*
- F. *Well, now, if we are taking account of the possibilities at hand, then perhaps he has undertaken responsibility to bring a freewill offering of birds?*
- G. *If that were the case, then the language that is used out to have been, “Lo, I undertake to present a nest of birds” {which is the usual way of formulating the matter}.*
- H. *But perhaps he had in mind to say, “Lo, I undertake responsibility to present the bird offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment of Lev. 13”?*
- I. *We deal with a case in which a Nazirite was passing by the man at that very time.*
- J. *But perhaps it was a Nazirite who had contracted corpse uncleanness and his intent was to present in his behalf the offerings that are required, so freeing him from the obligation to do so?*
- K. *It is a case in which a cultically clean Nazirite was passing before him.*
- L. *What is at issue between them?*
- M. *At issue between them is the case in which the man said, “I take upon myself the responsibility of presenting birds such as are mentioned in the same context as hair.” In R. Yohanan’s view, even though he made such a statement, if a Nazirite was passing by at that moment, he would be deemed a Nazirite, if not, he would not be deemed a Nazirite. In the view of R. Simeon b. Laqish, even though a Nazirite was not passing by at just that minute, [he still would be a Nazirite].*
- N. *And is there any authority who rejects the view that, when one refers to something, he means something else that occurs in the same context? Has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: [He who says,] “By the right hand,” — lo, this is an oath [T. Ned. 1:1A]? Now what is the governing consideration here? Is it not because it is written, “When he lifted up his right hand and his left hand to heaven and swore by him who lives forever” (Dan. 12: 7)*

[Klien: and when he refers to his right hand, he means the oath in the same context]?

- O. *Say: no, it is because “by my right hand” itself stands for an oath, as it has been taught on Tannaite authority: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that he who says, “by my right hand” — that that language means the taking of an oath? As it is said, “The Lord has sworn by his right hand” (Isa. 62: 8). And how do we know that one who says, “by my left hand” — that that is the language of an oath? Because the verse proceeds, “And by the arm of his strength” (Isa. 62: 8).*

1:2A-B

- A. **[He who says,] “Lo. I shall be an abstainer [Nazir] from grape pits” or “from grape skins” or “from haircuts” or “from uncleanness [of corpses]” — lo, this one is a .Nazirite [in all regards].**
- B. **And all the details of a Nazirite vow pertain to him.**
- I.1** A. *Our Mishnah-paragraph does not accord with the view of R. Simeon, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. R. Simeon says, “One is a liable [as a Nazirite] only if he takes the [Nazirite] vow in all regards.”
- C. *And rabbis say, “Even though he took the vow of a Nazirite only in one of the pertinent aspects, he is a Nazirite.”*
- D. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of R. Simeon?*
- E. Said Scripture, “He shall eat nothing that is made of the grape-vine, from the pressed grapes even to the grape-pit” (Num. 6: 4) [Klien: the emphasis is laid on the word ‘nothing,’ so that the vow must expressly include everything].
- F. *What is the scriptural foundation for the position of rabbis?*
- G. Said Scripture, “He shall abstain from wine and strong drink” (Num. 6: 3) [Klien: it is sufficient if his vow refers specifically to wine only].
- H. *Now, R. Simeon knows full well that it also is written, “He shall abstain from wine and strong drink” (Num. 6: 3)!*
- I. *He requires that clause to impose a prohibition on drinking wine as a religious duty as much as wine that is an optional matter.*
- J. *What is wine that is drunk as a religious duty?*
- K. *Wine for the Sanctification of the Sabbath and for the [Habdalah] rite of Distinguishing the Sabbath from the Week-Day.*
- L. [Why should such proof be required?] **[4A]** Lo, he is subject to a standing oath imposed from Mount Sinai!
- M. *Rather, it is in accord with what Raba said, “[If someone said,] ‘By an oath, I shall drink wine,’ and then went and said, ‘Lo, I am a Nazirite,” the Nazirite vow comes along and overrides the prior oath.”*

- N. But don't rabbis also require the verse at hand to prohibit the Nazirite's drinking wine as a matter of religious duty as much as wine that is optional?
- O. *If so, Scripture should have said, "from wine." What is the point of adding, "and strong drink"? That yields two lessons.*
- P. And R. Simeon?
- Q. *Here is the reason that Scripture added the language, "and strong drink:" To establish a verbal analogy to lend meaning to the same language used in connection with the sanctuary, for it is written, "Wine and strong drink you shall not drink, you or your sons with you" (Lev. 10: 9) — Just as for the Nazirite, only wine is forbidden, but not strong drink, so in the Temple rite, only wine is forbidden [to the priests] but not other strong drink.*
- R. *And that excludes the position of R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "He who eats Keilah-figs or drinks honey or milk and enters the Temple sanctuary is liable."*
- S. *If you prefer, I shall say, R. Simeon does not take the view that a prohibition takes effect in a situation in which a prohibition on some other count is already in effect, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon says, "He who eats carrion on the Day of Atonement is exempt from all penalty [by reason of violating the prohibitions of the Day of Atonement, having incurred liability by reason of the status of the meat as carrion]."*
- T. *Now from the perspective of rabbis too, is it not written, "He shall not eat anything that is made of the grape vine" (Num. 6: 4)?*
- U. *Rabbis will say to you, that teaches that diverse kinds of food that are prohibited to the Nazirite combine together to form the requisite minimum-mass on account of which liability is incurred.*
- V. *And R. Simeon/*
- W. *He does not take the view that diverse kinds of food that are prohibited to the Nazirite combine together to form the requisite minimum-mass on account of which liability is incurred, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon says, "Any volume at all of forbidden food suffices to impart liability to a flogging; a quantity of an olive is the minimum that is needed only where an offering is the penalty."*

1:2C

- C. [He who says,] "Lo, I shall be like Samson" or "like the son of Manoah" or "like the husband of Delilah" or "like the one who tore down the gates of Gaza" or "like the one whose eyes the Philistines plucked out" — lo, this one is a Nazirite in the status of Samson.

I.1 A. *Why was it necessary for the Mishnah-author to go over all these cases?*

- B. *It was necessary to specify each exemplary entry, for had he said only, "Lo, I shall be like Samson," I might have supposed he meant some other Samson. So the author of the passage had to cite "the son of Manoah" to limit the reference to the Samson.*
- C. *And had the Tannaite framer stated, "like the son of Manoah," I might have thought there are others who are named in that way, so we are told, "like the husband of Delilah," or, "like the one whose eyes the Philistines plucked out."*

1:2D-H

- D. **What is the difference between a lifelong Nazirite and a Nazirite in the status of Samson [also a Nazirite for life]?**
- E. **A lifelong Nazirite: If his hair gets too heavy, he lightens it with a razor and brings three [offerings of] cattle (Num. 6:14).**
- F. **And if he is made unclean, he brings an offering on account of uncleanness.**
- G. **A Nazirite in the status of Samson: If his hair gets too heavy, he does not lighten it.**
- H. **And if he is made unclean, he does not bring an offering on account of uncleanness.**

I.1 A. ...a lifelong Nazirite: whoever mentioned that item [and what is it doing here]?

- B. *The formulation exhibits a flaw, and this is the intent of the Tannaite formulation: He who says, "Lo, I shall be a lifelong Nazirite," lo, such a one is deemed a lifelong Nazirite. **What is the difference between a lifelong Nazirite and a Nazirite in the status of Samson [also a Nazirite for life]? If. his hair gets too heavy, he lightens it with a razor and brings three [offerings of] cattle (Num. 6:14). And if he is made unclean, he brings an offering on account of uncleanness. A Nazirite in the status of Samson: If. his hair gets too heavy, he does not lighten it. [4B] And if he is made unclean, he does not bring an offering on account of uncleanness.***

I.2 A. *It is an offering on account of uncleanness that he does not bring, but he is indeed a Nazirite in any event [and is not to contract corpse-uncleanness]. *Who then is the Tannaite authority behind our Mishnah-rule, since it cannot be either R. Judah or R. Simeon. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:**

- B. **R. Judah says, "A Nazirite in the status of Samson is permitted to become unclean with corpse-uncleanness. For Samson himself became unclean with corpse-uncleanness" [M. Naz. 1:2H].**
- C. **R. Simeon says, "He who says, 'Lo, I am like Samson,' has said nothing. For the language of Naziriteship has not gone forth from his lips [to encumber] him" [vs. M. Naz. 1:2C] [T. 1:5B-D].**
- D. *Now in accord with which of the cited authorities is our Mishnah-rule? It cannot be R. Judah, for in his view, to begin with the Nazirite in the status of Samson may contract corpse-uncleanness [without restriction], while our Mishnah-rule is formulated in the language of **if he is made unclean** [meaning, after the fact, he need not present an offering, but he is not permitted to contract corpse-*

uncleanness.] *And it cannot be R. Simeon, for he has said that the Nazirite oath does not take effect in any way whatsoever!*

- E. *In point of fact it is R. Judah, and [while the Nazirite in the status of Samson may contract corpse uncleanness], because in speaking of the Nazirite for life, the Mishnah frames the rule, if he should contract corpse uncleanness, the same language is used in referring to a Nazirite in the status of Samson.*

I.3 A. *May we say that at issue between R. Judah and R. Simeon is what is subject to dispute between the following Tannaite authorities, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. If someone said, “Lo, this is to me as a firstling” –

C. R. Jacob declares the oath binding.

D. R. Yosé releases it.

- E. *May we then not propose the following: R. Judah takes the view of R. Jacob, who has said, we do not require, for a vow to be valid, that the vow concern something that is subject to a vow [the firstling is not subject to the vow, being forbidden from birth in any event — just as in the case of Samson], and R. Simeon takes the position of R. Yosé, who has said that for a vow to be valid, it must concern something that to begin with is subject to a vow?*

- F. *Not at all, All the parties to the dispute before us concur that for a vow to be valid, it must concern something that to begin with is subject to a vow. But the matter of the firstling is different [and is subject to a vow, in Jacob’s view], because the pertinent verse, “If a man vow a vow” (Num. 30: 3), contains the language, “to the Lord,” and those superfluous words encompass the firstling as a legitimate object of comparison [Klien: since it must be dedicated to the Lord by the owner, the specification of those words is not required].*

G. And R. Yosé will say to you, “‘to the Lord’ *is required to encompass* [as subject to a vow] animals designated as sin-offerings or guilt-offerings [Klien: being obligatory, they might be thought not to count as things dedicated by a vow].

H. How come you encompass under the law of vowing, through the specified language, the animal designated as a sin offering or as a guilt offering but exclude the animal that is a firstling?

I. I encompass under the law the animal designated as a sin-offering or as a guilt-offering, for lo, these have to be designated through an explicit statement of matters, but I exclude the firstling, since that does not have to be explicitly designated [but is designated as a firstling by the fact of birth].

J. And R. Jacob will say to you, “Firstlings also have to be explicitly designated, *for it has been taught on Tannaite authority*: Members of the household of our Rabbi have said, “How do we know that one to whom a firstling has been born in his flock has the religious duty of making a formal act of consecration [of that same firstling]? ‘You will sanctify the male’ (Deu. 15:19).”

- K. And R. Yosé will say to you, *“Granted that it is a religious duty to designate it as a holy beast being a firstling, still, if he did not sanctify it, isn’t it sanctified anyhow? [Of course it is!]*

I.4 A. With reference to the Nazirite too, it is written, “to the Lord” (Num. 6: 2) [so why by the stated reasoning can one not take a vow to become a Nazirite like Samson]?

B. *That is required for the interpretation set forth in what we have learned on Tannaite authority:*

C. **Said Simeon the Righteous, “Only once in my lifetime have I eaten a guilt-offering presented by a Nazirite who had become unclean. Once a Nazirite came to me from the south, and I saw that he had beautiful eyes, a handsome face, and thick curly locks. I said to him, ‘My son, how come you vowed to destroy this lovely hair of yours [in a Nazirite’s hair-offering]?’”**

D. **“He said to me, ‘I was a shepherd for my father in my village. I came to draw water from a well, saw my reflection in the water, and my evil impulse rushed upon me and tried to drive me out of this world [by making me sin, with pride]. I said to it, “Evil one! You oughtn’t to have taken pride in something that does not belong to you, something that is going to turn into dust, worms, and corruption. Lo, I take upon myself the obligation to shave you off for the sake of Heaven.””**

E. **“Forthwith I got up and kissed him on the head, saying, ‘My son, may there be many Nazirites of such pure motive as you in Israel. You are the person to whom Scripture referred when it said, “When either a man or a woman shall separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazirite, to separate themselves to the Lord” (Num. 6: 2)” [T. Naz. 4:7].**

I.5 A. But wasn’t Samson a Nazirite [by reason of a vow]? Surely it is written, “For the child shall be a Nazirite to God from the womb” (Jud. 15:16)!

B. *In that case it was the angel who said it.*

I.6 A. *And how do we know that Samson did contract corpse uncleanness?*

B. *Might I say that it is because it is written, “With the jawbone of an ass I have smitten a thousand men” (Jud. 15:16)? But perhaps he [Klien:] thrust it at them without touching them?*

C. *Rather, from the following: “And he smote thirty men of them and took their spoil” (Jud. 15:19).*

D. *Here too, perhaps he stripped them first and then killed them?*

- E. *It is explicitly written, “And he smote” and then “took”!*
- F. *Maybe he mortally wounded them.*
- G. *Rather, it is learned by tradition.*

I.7 A. And as to a lifelong Nazirite, *where is it written in Scripture?*

B. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **R. Judah the Patriarch says, “Absalom was a lifelong Nazirite, and he cut his hair once in twelve months, as it is said, ‘And at the end of forty years Absalom said to the king, “Pray let me go and pay my vow, which I have vowed to the Lord, in Hebron. For your servant vowed a vow while I dwelt at Geshur in Aram, saying, ‘If the Lord will indeed bring me back to Jerusalem, then I will offer worship to the Lord’” (2Sa. 15: 7-8). He would cut his hair every twelve months, as it is said, ‘And when he cut his hair, now it was at every year’s end that he cut it’ (2Sa. 14:26), [5A] and the meaning of ‘year’s end’ derives from the analogy supplied by the houses in walled cities (Lev. 25:29): just as in that connection, the expression means, twelve months, so here it means twelve months.”**

D. **R. Nehorai says, “He cut his hair once in thirty days, as it is said, ‘For at the end of every year’ (2Sa. 14:26).”**

E. **R. Yosé says, “He cut it every Friday, for so it is the custom of princes, to cut their hair every Friday, as it is said with regard to priests, ‘They shall not shave their heads or let their locks grow long, they shall only trim the hair of their heads’ (Eze. 44:20)” [T. Sotah 3:16C-E].**

F. *What is the operative consideration of Rabbi? He derives an analogy from the case of the use of “days” in connection with houses in walled cities. But lo, Rabbi is the very one who said, “‘Days’ used in that connection means no fewer than two days.”*

G. *This very analogy introduces to deal with the reference to the heaviness of the hair, and there is no heavy growth in merely two days.*

H. *But might one not say that he gets a hair cut every two years [and not one, as Rabbi has said], as it is written, “And it came to pass at the end of two years of days” (2Sa. 14:26)??*

I. *We draw an analogy from a case in which “days” occurs without reference to “years” for a case in which “days” is used without reference to “years,” but let proof not be produced from this case, in which there is a reference to “days” in which “years” also occurs.*

J. *But might one not say that he gets a haircut every thirty days, in which connection there is a verse, “but a whole month of days” (Num. 11:20)?*

K. *We draw an analogy from a case in which days occurs without reference to “a month of days,” for a case in which “days” is used without reference to “a month of days,” but let proof not be produced from this case, in which there is a reference to “days” along with “a month.”*

- L. Why not produce the inference from the use of “from days to days” (Jud. 11:40) [Jephthah’s daughter was visited “four days in the year,” every three months]?
- M. We draw an analogy from a case in which “days” is mentioned for another case in which “days” is mentioned, but we do not produce evidence from a case in which there is a reference to “from days to days.”
- N. *But what difference is there to be drawn from the use of “from days to days”? And lo, a Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: “‘And the priest shall return and the priest shall come’ (Lev. 14:39, Lev. 14:44) — [for purposes of inference] ‘returning’ and ‘coming’ are the same thing.”*
- O. *That is the case [that they are one and the same thing, so inference can be established on the basis of meaning, not word-choice] where there is no identical expression [on which to build the analogy], but here, where there is an identical expression, we do draw our analogy from the identical expression. [Klien: since there is another context where the word ‘days’ occurs, we learn from that and not from ‘to days.’”]*
- P. *There are those who state yet [another reason for not drawing the analogy from the usage, “to days,”]: Now how do we know that they went once every three months? Can the “four times a year” have occurred at intervals of four months and of two months? [So we do not know what “to days” meant.]*

- Q. **R. Nehorai says, “He cut his hair once in thirty days, as it is said, ‘For at the end of every year’ (2Sa. 14:26):” What is the operative consideration?**
- R. In the case of priests, it is because the hair becomes a burden every thirty days, and here too, it would be a burden after thirty days [in line with 2Sa. 14:26].
- S. **R. Yosé says, “He cut it every Friday, for so it is the custom of princes, to cut their hair every Friday:”**
- T. *So what differentiated him from the rest of his brothers [who were also princes]?*
- U. A festival that happened to fall in the middle of the week. *In such a case his brothers would cut their hair but he would not cut his hair.*
- V. *Or, also, his brothers could get a hair cut Friday morning, but he got a haircut only toward dusk.*

I.8 A. *As to the forty years, what’s the point [“And at the end of forty years Absalom said to the king, ‘Pray let me go...” (2Sa. 15: 7-8)]?*

- B. R. Nehorai says in the name of R. Joshua, “It is the forty years after the Israelites had asked for a king.”
- C. *A Tannaite statement:* The year in which they asked for a king was the tenth year of Samuel the Ramathite’s [authority].

1:3A

A. **A Nazirite vow that is unspecified [as to length] is for a period of thirty days.**

I.1 A. *What is the source of this rule?*

- B. Said R. Mattena, “Said Scripture, ‘He shall be holy’ (Num. 6: 5), and the numerical value of the letters that make up the word ‘shall be’ is thirty.”
- C. Bar Peda said, “It matches the number of times that parts of the root NZR occur in the Torah, which is thirty-minus-one.”
- D. *And from the perspective of R. Mattena too, why not derive the rule from the number of times that NZR occurs in the Torah?*
- E. *He will say to you, “Some of these are required for their own purpose,” as will now be made specific:*
- F. “He shall abstain [YZYR] from drinking wine and strong drink” (Num. 6: 3) — that usage serves to forbid drinking wine that is a religious duty [e.g., for the Sanctification of the Sabbath] as much as wine that is an optional matter.
- G. “Shall clearly utter a vow, the vow of a Nazirite, to consecrate himself” (Num. 6: 2) — this teaches that one may adopt a Nazirite vow who is already subject to a Nazirite vow [and the second vow takes effect on top of the first].
- H. **[5B]** And from the perspective of Bar Peda [what is to be said in the same context]?
- I. *He will say to you, “Is there not a single one of the occurrences of words in the root NZR that does not serve for the exegesis of the law? Now, since that one clearly is utilized simply for computation, all of the others likewise serve for the purpose of consecration.”*
- J. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **A Nazirite vow that is unspecified [as to length] is for a period of thirty days.** Now, from the perspective of R. Mattena, that poses no problem. But it does present a difficulty to Bar Peda [who would prefer a spell of twenty-nine days]!*
- K. *Bar Peda will say to you, “Since the spell comes to an end on the thirtieth day, when the Nazirite cuts his hair and presents his sacrifices, the formulation involves thirty days [even though the actual vow is for twenty-nine].”*
- L. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **He who said, “Lo, I am a Nazirite,” cuts his hair on the thirty-first day [M. 3:1A].** Now, from the perspective of R. Mattena, that poses no problem. But it does present a difficulty to Bar Peda.*
- M. *Bar Peda will say to you, “Note the continuation of the same rule: **But if he cut it on the thirtieth day, he has fulfilled his obligation [M. 3:1B].** So the continuation of the rule sustains his position, but the opening part of the clause is treated as though it said, “[I declare myself a Nazirite for thirty] whole days.”*

- N. *Doesn't the continuation-clause present a difficulty to R. Mattena?*
- O. *He takes the position that part of a day is reckoned as equivalent to the entire day.*
- P. *We have learned in the Mishnah: [If he said,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite for thirty days, if he cut his hair on the thirtieth day, he has not fulfilled his obligation [M. 3:1C].*
- Q. *It is a case in which he said, “[I declare myself a Nazirite for thirty] whole days.”*
- R. *We have learned in the Mishnah: 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 [M. 3:2A]. Now, from the perspective of R. Mattena, that poses no problem. [6A] But it does present a difficulty to Bar Peda.*
- S. *Bar Peda will say to you, “Note the continuation of the same rule: And if he cut his hair for the first on the thirtieth day, he cuts his hair for the second on the sixtieth day [M. 3:2B]. So the continuation-clause sustains his position, but the opening clause is read as though he formulated the vow as, ‘whole days.’”*
- T. *Doesn't the continuation-clause present a difficulty to R. Mattena?*
- U. *He will say to you, “It is in accord with the Tannaite formulation of the continuation of the rule: For the thirtieth day counts for him among the number [of days of both Nazirite vows].*
- V. *How does this work?*
- W. *Part of a day is reckoned as equivalent to the entire day.*
- X. *He's already said that once [and why should the Tannaite framer of the passage provide the occasion to draw the same conclusion twice?!]*
- Y. *What might you have supposed? That is the case in the matter of a single Nazirite vow, but in the case of two successive Nazirite vows, that would not be the rule. So we are informed that that conclusion is not valid.*
- Z. *We have learned in the Mishnah: But if he cut his hair on the sixtieth day less one, he [nonetheless] has fulfilled his obligation [M. 3:2C]. Now, from the perspective of R. Mattena, that poses no problem. But it does present a difficulty to Bar Peda, for lo, he has said that the normal spell is thirty days less one!*
- AA. *He will say to you, “I too depend upon this very passage [for my ruling].”*
- BB. *We have learned in the Mishnah: 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] [M. 3:3A-C]. Now, from the perspective of R. Mattena, that poses no problem. But it does present a difficulty to Bar Peda.*
- CC. *[6B] Bar Peda will say to you, “Proceed to the continuation clause: R. Eliezer says, ‘He loses only seven days’ [M. 3:3D]. Now if you should imagine that we require thirty days, then the man should lose all thirty days [the uncleanness having been contracted while the vow is still in force].”*
- DD. *[R. Mattena responds:] R. Eliezer takes the view that part of a day is equivalent to the whole of that day.*
- EE. *We have learned in the Mishnah: “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” [M. 3:4A-D]. Now, if you*

should imagine that R. Eliezer takes the view, part of a day is equivalent to the whole of that day, he should lose seven days [Klien: since he is unable to offer his Nazirite sacrifices until he has been sprinkled with the ashes of the red cow on the third and seventh days]. *If he does not regard part of a day as equivalent to the whole of that day, he should lose the entire span of time!*

- FF. *As a matter of fact, we do not rule that part of the day is equivalent to the whole of the day.*
- GG. *If so, then why does he not lose the entire span of time that he has observed?*
- HH. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Here is the scriptural reasoning of R. Eliezer. Scripture said, ‘And this is the law of the Nazirite, on the day when the days of his consecration are fulfilled’ (Num. 6:13) — the Torah has said, if he contracts uncleanness on the day of fulfillment, the law of the Nazirite vow applies to him [once again, for thirty days].” [Klien: not more, not less, without regard to whether or not part of the day is equivalent to the whole day.]*
- II. *May one say that the disagreement between R. Mattena and Bar Peda runs along the lines of the following conflict of Tannaite authorities:*
- JJ. *“From the clause, ‘Until the days be fulfilled’ (Num. 6: 5), I infer that the smallest number of days for the vow to pertain is two days. Scripture states, ‘He will be holy, he will let his hair grow long’ (Num. 6: 5), and hair does not grow long in less than thirty days,” the words of R. Josiah.*
- KK. *R. Jonathan says, “It is not necessary to provide that proof, for lo, Scripture says, ‘until the days be fulfilled,’ and the issue then is, what days are the ones that have to be fulfilled? You must say, the thirty days of the month.” [The ordinary lunar month is twenty-nine days; a ‘fulfilled’ one is thirty days.]*
- LL. *Now may one not propose, R. Mattena makes his ruling in accord with the position of R. Josiah, and Bar Peda concurs with what R. Jonathan has said?*
- MM. *R. Mattena will say to you, “All parties concur that we require thirty days. And here what is at issue is the matter of whether the sense of ‘up to’ is ‘up to and including the specified time.’ R. Josiah takes the view that the sense of ‘up to’ is not to say, ‘up to and including,’ and R. Jonathan maintains that ‘up to,’ means, ‘up to and including.’”*
- NN. *The master has said, “what days are the ones that have to be fulfilled? You must say, the thirty days of the month.”*
- OO. *But might one not say, a week? [A Sabbath, six working days completed by the Sabbath to make a week (Klien)].*
- PP. *In the case of a week, what would be lacking [to validate the resort to the language, “fulfilled”]?*
- QQ. **[7A]** *And might one not say, a year?*
- RR. *But in the case of the year, do we reckon the matter in days? And lo, rabbis of Caesarea have said, “How on the*

basis of Scripture do we know that the year is not reckoned in days? Scripture has said, ‘months of a year’ (Exo. 12: 2) — months are counted towards years, days are not counted toward years.”

1:3B-C

- B.** If he said, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for one long spell,” “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for one short spell,” or. even “From now until [for as long as it takes to go to] the end of the world” —
- C.** he is a Nazirite for thirty days.
- I.1 A.** *Why should that be the case? Hasn’t he said, “from here to the end of the world”?*
- B.** *This is the sense of the statement: “This matter is as protracted for me as though it would last from now to the end of the world.”*
- C.** *We have learned in the Mishnah: [If he said,] “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite from here to such-and-such a place,” they make an estimate of how many days it takes to go from here to such-and-such a place. If it is less than thirty days, he is a Nazirite for thirty days. And if not, he is a Nazirite in accord with the number of days [required to go to such-and-such a place] [M. 1:5]. Now why should that be the case? Why not maintain here too, “This matter is as protracted for me as though it would last for the time it takes to go from here to such-and-such a place”?*
- D.** Said Raba, “It is a case in which he was setting out on a journey.” [Klien: we assume that the journey and the length of the Naziriteship are connected.]
- E.** *Why not let him observe a Nazirite-spell of thirty days for each parasang of the trip?*
- F.** *Said R. Pappa, “We deal with a locale in which they do not count parasangs.”*
- G.** *Then let him observe a Nazirite-spell for each stage on the trip, for haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: [He who said,] “I will be a Nazirite like the hairs of my head” or “like the dust of the earth” or “like the sand of the sea” — lo, this one is a lifetime Nazirite. But he cuts his hair once every thirty days.*
- H.** *[The rule that he keeps a sequence of Nazirite-spells] does not apply to a vow in which a finite term is mentioned [“from here to there”], and this has been stated as a Tannaite rule in so many words, for has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: “Lo, I am a Nazirite all the days of my life,” “Lo, I am a lifelong Nazirite” — lo, this one is a life long Nazirite. “...even for a hundred years,” “...even for a thousand years,” this one is not a lifelong Nazirite, but he is a Nazirite for life [T. 1:5] [and can never get a haircut].*
- I.** Rabbah said, “Hair is a special case, [not the same as parasangs or stages in a trip], since the one is differentiated from the other.”

- J. *The days too are differentiated from one another, for lo, it is written, “And there was evening, and there was morning, one day” (Gen. 1: 2).*
- K. *In that case it is not that they are distinct, but the verse serves to indicate that a day with the prior night together count as a day, though days are not distinct from one another.*
- L. *Raba said, “What’s the point of all these objections! The case at hand [From here to the end of the earth] is special, for he has already said, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for one spell.”*

1:3D-E

- D. **[If he said,] “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite and for one day [more],” “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite and for one hour [more],” “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for one spell and a half” —**
- E. **lo, he is a Nazirite for two spells [of thirty days].**
- I.1 A. *Why in the world was it necessary for the Tannaite framer to encompass all of these cases?*
- B. *It was necessary to do so, for had he set forth the case, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite and for one day [more],” one might have supposed, in this case in particular we invoke the rule, the vow of the Nazirite does not take effect for only a single day. On that account, he must count out two [spells as a Nazirite]. But [I might have supposed] that if he had said, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite and for one hour [more],” let him observe thirty-one days. So we are informed to the contrary.*
- C. **[7B]** *And had he set forth only the case, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite and for one hour [more],” [one might have supposed that he must observe two spells as a Nazirite] because he obviously did not speak precisely [since the Nazirite vow takes effect in terms of days, not hours], but had he said, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite and for one day [more],” he was speaking with precision, so one might have supposed that he should not have to observe two spells as a Nazirite. So we are told that in both cases, he must observe two spells as a Nazirite.*

1:3F-G

- F. **[If he said,] “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for thirty days and for one hour,” he is a Nazirite for thirty days and for one day,**
- G. **for Nazirite vows are not taken by the measure of hours.**
- I.1 A. Said Rab, “They have taught this rule only if he said, ‘Thirty-one days,’ but if he had said, ‘Thirty days and one day,’ he is a Nazirite for two spells.”
- B. *Rab concurs with the reasoning of R. Aqiba, who assigns exegetical value to redundant [or superfluous] language, for we have learned in the Mishnah: Nor [has he sold] (4) the cistern, or (5) the cellar, even though he wrote him [in the deed], “The depth and height.” “But [the seller] has to purchase [from the buyer] a right-of-way [to the cistern or the cellar],” the words of R. Aqiba. [Klien: he does not retain a right-o-way to the cistern and cellar unless he explicitly*

reserves it for himself.] And sages say, “He does not have to purchase a right-of-way.” and R. Aqiba concedes that when [the seller] said, “Except for these,” he does not have to purchase a right-of-way for himself [M. **B.B.** 4:2A-F].

1:4-5

1:4

- A. [8A] [He who said,] “I will be a Nazirite like the hairs of my head” or “like the dust of the earth” or “like the sand of the sea” — lo, this one is a lifetime Nazirite.
- B. But he cuts his hair once every thirty days.
- C. Rabbi says, “Such a one as this does not cut his hair once every thirty days.
- D. “But who is the one who cuts his hair once every thirty days?
- E. “It is he who says, ‘Lo, I pledge myself to as many [distinct] Nazirite vows as the hairs of my head’ or ‘as the dust of the earth’ or ‘as the sand of the sea.’”
- F. [He who says,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite, a jugful” or “a basketful” —
- G. they examine his intention.
- H. And if he said, “I intended to take a Nazirite vow for one long period,” he is a Nazirite for thirty days.
- I. But if he said, “I took a Nazirite vow without specification,” they regard the basket as if it is full of mustard seeds.
- J. And he is a Nazirite for the rest of his life.

1:5

- A. [If he said,] “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite from here to such-and-such a place,”
- B. they make an estimate of how many days it takes to go from here to such-and-such a place.
- C. If it is less than thirty days, he is a Nazirite for thirty days.
- D. And if not, he is a Nazirite in accord with the number of days [required to go to such-and-such a place].
- E. [If he said,] “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite according to the number of days of the year,”
- F. he counts his Nazirite spell in accord with the number of days of the year.
- G. Said R. Judah, “There was a case of this sort, and once he had fulfilled his Nazirite vow, he dropped dead”

- I.1** A. they regard the basket as if it is full of mustard seeds. And he is a Nazirite for the rest of his life: *but why? Rather regard the basket as though it were full of cucumbers or gourds and so he will have a remedy!*
- B. Said Hezekiah, “This rule has been taught subject to dispute, and it represents the opinion, stated without attribution, of R. Simeon, who has said, ‘A man may poke himself into a situation that is subject to doubt [by reason of an ambiguity] in language, such that a greater stringency comes about than the use of precise language [would have produced].’”
- C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- D. **“Lo, I am a Nazirite, on condition that in this pile of wheat of mine there should be a hundred *kor*,”**
- E. **and he went and found it had been stolen or had gotten lost —**
- F. **it is a matter of doubt whether or not there was that volume of wheat in the mound — .**
- G. **R. Simeon declares him liable.**
- H. **For in Nazirite-vows, a vow subject to doubt is binding** [Bavli: a vow subject to doubt is treated in a stringent way].
- I. **R. Judah declares him exempt.**
- J. **For in Nazirite-vows a vow subject to doubt is not binding** [Bavli: a vow subject to doubt is treated in a lenient way].
- K. **[T. adds:] He therefore should say, “If matters were as I said, lo, I am a Nazirite out of obligation. And if not, lo, I am a Nazirite out of free will” [T. 2:9A-H].**
- L. *R. Yohanan said, “You may even say it represents the view of R. Judah. In that case the man may not have descended into the status of the Nazirite at all [there may have been a hundred kor in the pile], but here, the man has certainly descended into the status of the Nazirite [whatever the contents of the basket, there is no doubt of the outcome]. How is he to be raised up from that status? [Surely he is a Nazirite for life!]”*
- M. [Assuming the intent of L is that the man is regarded as a Nazirite for life, the question is asked:] *Why not regard the basket as though it were full of cucumbers or gourds so that he will have a remedy for his situation?*
- N. *Don’t think that thought! For he has taken upon himself a Naziriteship* [Klien: and if he presents his offerings at the end of the number of days that the basket contains gourds or cucumbers, he may turn out to present profane animals in the sanctuary, as his Naziriteship may be of longer duration; thus he becomes a Nazirite for life]. **[8B] For R. Judah concurs with the reasoning of Rabbi, for we have learned in the Mishnah: [He who said,] “I will be a Nazirite like the hairs of my head” or “like the dust of the earth” or “like the sand of the sea” — lo, this one is a lifetime Nazirite. But he cuts his hair once every thirty days. Rabbi says, “Such a one as this does not cut his hair once every thirty days. But who is the one who cuts his hair once every thirty days? It is he who says, ‘Lo, I pledge myself to as many [distinct] Nazirite vows as the hairs of my head’ or ‘as the dust of the earth’ or ‘as the sand of the sea.’”**
- O. *Does R. Judah concur with the reasoning of Rabbi? For we have learned in the Mishnah: If he said, “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite according to the number of days of the year,” he counts his Nazirite spell in accord with the number of days of the year. Said R. Judah, “There was a case of this sort, and once he had fulfilled his Nazirite vow, he dropped dead “ Now if you say that the man has undertaken consecutive spells as a Nazirite, [365 spells of 30 days each] then we can understand why R. Judah holds, when he finished [thirty years having gone by] he died. But if you say that he undertook to observe a single spell as a Nazirite [one lasting as long as the sun, that is, for ever], could it ever be*

said that that man had fulfilled his Nazirite vow under any circumstances? Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “[If someone said,] ‘Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for the number of piles of the fig crop or the number of ears in the field in the Sabbatical Year,’ he must observe spells as a Nazirite corresponding to the number of heaps of the fig crop or the number of ears in the field in the Sabbatical year” [T. 1:3G-I]. [Klien: while Rabbi holds that in such a case he would have to count only as many days as there are heaps of figs].

- P. In a situation where the man explicitly uses the word “number,” the rule is different.
- Q. *But does Rabbi make a distinction in a situation where the man explicitly uses the word “number”? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. **“Lo, I am a Nazirite in accord with the days of the solar year,” he is a Nazirite for three hundred sixty-five spells of Naziriteship, in accord with the number of days of the solar year.**
- S. **“... in accord with the days of the moon,” “... in accord with the number of the days of the moon,” — he is a Nazirite for three hundred fifty-four spells of Naziriteship, in accord with the number of the days of the lunar year.**
- T. Rabbi says, **“[This is valid] only if he will say, ‘Lo, I am a Nazirite for the number of Nazirite spells equivalent to the days of the solar year,’ ‘... equivalent to the number of days of the solar year,’ ‘... equivalent to the days of the lunar year,’ ‘... equivalent to the number of days of the lunar year’” [T. 1:3D-F]. [According to Rabbi, even if he omitted the word “number,” the rule would be the same, so long as he used the language, “Nazirite.”]**
- U. *R. Judah concurs with Rabbi on one point and differs from him on another. He concurs with him: the man has undertaken to observe a single spell s a Nazirite [when he says, “I shall be a Nazirite as the capacity of this house].” And he differs from him on the other, for while R. Judah differentiates cases where the word “number” is used from those in which it is not used, Rabbi makes no such distinction.*

I.2 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **“Lo, I am a Nazirite all the days of my life,” “Lo, I am a lifelong Nazirite” — lo, this one is a life long Nazirite. “...even for a hundred years,” “...even for a thousand years,” this one is not a lifelong Nazirite, but he is a Nazirite for life [T. 1:5] [and can never get a haircut].**

I.3 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **[If he said,] “Lo, I am a Nazirite and one,” lo, this one is a Nazirite for two spells [M. Naz. 1:3D]. [If he said,] “... and more,” lo, he is a Nazirite for**

three spells. [If he said,] “... one and more and again,” lo, this one is a Nazirite for four spells [T. 1:2C-E].

- C. *That’s obvious!*
- D. *Not at all, for what might you otherwise have said? With the language, and again he made reference to the entire prior number and so is liable for six spells as a Nazirite, and thus we are informed that that is not the case.*

I.4 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Lo, I am a Nazirite” — Sumkhos says, “If he added, ‘hen,’ he is liable for a single spell, ‘digon,’ two; ‘trigon,’ three, ‘tetragon,’ four, ‘pentagon,’ five” [T. 1:2].”

I.5 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: (1) A round house, (2) a three-cornered house, [(3) a house that is built on a ship, or (4) on a raft, or (5) on four beams, is not susceptible to uncleanness through plagues since it is not resting on the ground]. (1) And if it was four-sided, (2) even on four pillars, it is susceptible [M. Neg. 12:1C-D].*

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the rule on the four-sided one?*
- C. *Scripture uses the word “walls” in the plural, in both the latter and the former part of the passage (Lev. 14:39, 37), instead of “wall” in the singular — four in all.*