

HALAKHA

So too here, the term *yamim* means twelve months – אף באן שנים עשר חודש: A permanent nazirite may trim his hair with a razor once every twelve months if it becomes too heavy for him, as derived from the case of Absalom (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 3:12).

NOTES

Once every thirty days – אחת לשלשים יום: Some explain that the dispute cited in the *baraita* pertains only to the conduct of Absalom. However, with regard to the *halakha* itself, they all agree that a permanent nazirite may cut his hair once a month (Commentary on *Nazir*). Others explain that it is unlikely that they would have argued only about the case of Absalom. Rather, the dispute pertains to the *halakhot* of a permanent nazirite in general, and the case of Absalom is cited only as evidence (*Mishne LaMelekh*). The statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi in the Jerusalem Talmud seems to support this conclusion.

As we find that the sons of kings – שכן מצניו בבני מלכים: In other words, it is known that the custom of princes is to have their hair cut on a weekly basis. Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*, points out that this is referring only to the king's sons, whereas the king himself cuts his hair every day. Other commentaries add that although the verse states that his hair was heavy for him, and hair does not grow that much in a week, since a prince is used to cutting his hair every week, if he were to fail to do so his hair would feel heavy to him.

BACKGROUND

Verbal analogy – גזירה שוה: This is a fundamental talmudic principle of biblical interpretation, appearing in all standard lists of exegetical principles. If the same word or phrase appears in two places in the Torah, and a certain *halakha* is explicitly stated in one of these places, it may be inferred on the basis of a verbal analogy that the same *halakha* must apply in the other case as well. Consequently, the inferences drawn on the basis of verbal analogy rely on verbal identity rather than on conceptual similarity. For example, the Torah states, concerning those convicted of certain types of sorcery: "Shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones; their blood shall be upon them" (Leviticus 20:27). Since this verse uses the expression "their blood shall be upon them" when speaking of death by stoning, the Talmud infers by verbal analogy that in all cases where this expression is used, capital punishment is to be inflicted by stoning. Generally, inferences are drawn through verbal analogy only if the same word or phrase appears in both of the verses being compared, although a verbal analogy is occasionally drawn even if the words being compared are not identical, provided that their meanings are similar.

ויולף ימים ימים מפתח ערי חומה, מה התם שנים עשר חודש – אף באן שנים עשר חודש.

רבי נהוראי אומר: מגלח אחת לשלשים יום. רבי יוסי אומר: מגלח מערב שבת לערב שבת, שכן מצניו בבני מלכים שמגלחים מערב שבת לערב שבת.

מאי טעמא דרבי – יולף מפתח ערי חומה, והא רבי הוא דאמר: אין ימים פחותין משנים!

האי גזירה שוה משום כובד גמיר, ובשני ימים ליכא כובד.

ואימא שתי שנים, דכתיב ויהי מקץ שנתים ימים! דנין ימים שאין עמהן שנים מ"ימים שאין עמהן שנים, ואל יוכיח זה שיש עמו שנים.

ואימא שלשים יום, דכתיב עד תדש ימים! דנין ימים שאין עמהן חודשים מ"ימים שאין עמהן חודשים, ואל יוכיח זה שיש עמו חודשים.

ואימא מהכא מימים ימימה וגו' דנין ימים מימים. ואין דנין ימים מימימה.

And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derives the meaning of the term *yamim* stated with regard to Absalom based upon a verbal analogy from the word *yamim* that appears in the context of houses of walled cities, where it states: "For a full year [*yamim*] he shall have the right of redemption" (Leviticus 25:29). Just as there, in the case of walled cities, the term *yamim* means twelve months, as the verse states immediately afterward: "Within the space of a full year" (Leviticus 25:30), so too here, in the case of Absalom, the term *yamim* means twelve months.^h

Rabbi Nehorai says: Absalom cut his hair once every thirty days.ⁿ Rabbi Yosei says: He cut his hair from one Shabbat eve to another Shabbat eve, as we find that the sons of kingsⁿ cut their hair from one Shabbat eve to another Shabbat eve.

The Gemara asks: What is the reasoning of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? He derives the meaning of the verse concerning Absalom from the verse concerning houses of walled cities. But isn't it Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi himself who said that one may not redeem his house until it has been in the buyer's possession for at least two days, as the word *yamim* does not refer to fewer than two days? This demonstrates that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi understands the word *yamim* in the case of walled city houses as referring to a period of two days rather than a year. How then can he employ a verbal analogy from houses of walled cities to derive that the word *yamim* in the case of Absalom indicates a period of twelve months?

The Gemara answers: He learned this verbal analogy^b because the verse states that Absalom would trim his hair due to its weight (II Samuel 14:26), and in two days there is no significant weight added to the hair. Consequently, the term *yamim* cannot be understood to mean two days in the case of Absalom.

The Gemara asks: But say that *yamim* means two years, as it is written: "And it came to pass at the end of two years of days [*yamim*]" (Genesis 41:1). The Gemara rejects this: We derive the meaning of the term *yamim* in a case where it does not have the term years mentioned with it, as in the case of Absalom, from another usage of the term *yamim* that does not have the term years mentioned with it, i.e., the verse about houses of walled cities. And this usage of the term *yamim* that does have the term years mentioned with it will not prove otherwise.

The Gemara asks: But say that *yamim* means thirty days, as it is written: "But a month of days [*yamim*]" (Numbers 11:20). The Gemara rejects this: We derive the meaning of the term *yamim* in a case where it does not have the term months mentioned with it from another usage of the term *yamim* that does not have the term months mentioned with it. And this usage of the term *yamim* that does have the term months mentioned with it will not prove otherwise.

The Gemara asks: But say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi should have derived the meaning of the term *yamim* from here: "The daughters of Israel went from time to time [*yamim yamima*] to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year" (Judges 11:40). This teaches that the daughters of Israel would go four times a year, each time for one day, to lament her, in which case *yamim yamima* means once every three months. The Gemara rejects this: We derive the meaning of the term *yamim* from another usage of the term *yamim*, and we do not derive the meaning of the term *yamim* from a case where the word *yamim* is used in conjunction with the term *yamima*.

ומאי נפקא מינה? והא תנא דבי רבי
ישמעאל: "ושב הכהן", "ובא הכהן" – זו
היא שיבה זו היא ביאה!

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And what is the difference** between *yamim* and *yamima*? **Didn't the school of Rabbi Yishmael teach** a verbal analogy with regard to leprosy of houses between the words "and the priest shall return [*veshav*]" (Leviticus 14:39) and the words "and the priest shall come [*uva*]" (Leviticus 14:44)? It is derived from this that just as **this is the halakha** with regard to **returning**, i.e., the priest returns after seven days, **this is the halakha** with regard to **coming**, which is also after seven days. Just as the Hebrew words *veshav* and *uva* can be used in a verbal analogy, certainly two words with a less pronounced variation, i.e., *yamim* and *yamima*, can be used to teach a verbal analogy.

הני מילי – היכא דליכא דדמי ליה, אכל
היכא דאיכא דדמי ליה – מדדמי ליה
לפינין.

The Gemara responds: **This applies only where there are no terms that are identical to it. However, where there are terms that are identical to it, we derive the meaning of a term from the usage of terms that are identical to it rather than from the usage of terms that are merely similar.**

איכא דאמרי: מנא ידעינן דכל תלתא
ירחין חד זימנא? דילמא ארבעה זימני
בשתא, (אי נמי) ארבעה ירחין חד
זימנא, תרין ירחין בחד זימנא.

Some say that the reason the halakha is not derived from yamim yamima is because the time period to which it refers is unclear: From where do we know that they would lament Jephthah's daughter once every three months, at fixed intervals? Perhaps they would lament her four times a year, in irregular intervals. Alternatively, it might have taken place in regular but uneven intervals, e.g., after four months they would visit one time,^N and then after two months they would visit one time, and then they would visit again after a four-month interval and again after a two-month interval.

רבי נהוראי אומר מגלח אחת לשלשים
יום. מאי טעמא גבי כהנים – משום
דאיכא כובד, הכא נמי איכא כובד.

It was taught in the *baraita* that **Rabbi Nehorai says** that Absalom cut his hair **once every thirty days**. The Gemara explains the basis for this opinion: **What is the reason that with regard to priests,^N the halakha is that they must cut their hair every thirty days? It is because after that interval there is noticeable weight to the hair. Here, too, in the case of Absalom, there is noticeable weight after this period of time has passed, and it is clear that Absalom cut his hair due to its weight, as it is stated: "Because the hair was heavy on him, therefore he polled it" (II Samuel 14:26).**

רבי יוסי אומר: מגלח מערב שבת לערב
שבת. מאי איכא ביניה לשאר אחוהי?

It was taught in the *baraita* that **Rabbi Yosei says: Absalom cut his hair from one Shabbat eve to another Shabbat eve**, as the sons of kings would cut their hair every Shabbat eve. The Gemara asks: **If so, what difference is there between Absalom, who was a nazirite, and the rest of his brothers,^N King David's sons, who also cut their hair once a week?**

NOTES

ארבעה ירחין חד – ארבעה חודשים הם ירחין חד. The logic here is that they would travel more frequently in the summer, since it is harder to leave the house during the winter months (*Leket HaKotzerim*). Some manuscripts and other sources do not contain this sentence.

מאי – What is the reason that with regard to priests, etc. – **טעמא גבי כהנים וכו'**: The early commentaries point out that the *halakha* that priests must cut their hair once a month is not explicitly stated in the Bible, which merely says: "And they will not let their locks grow long" (Ezekiel 44:20). Rather, it is derived through a verbal analogy between a verse pertaining to a priest and one concerning a nazirite (see *Taanit* 17a): Since an unspecified term of naziriteship is thirty days, it is derived that a priest cuts his hair every thirty days. That being the case, why does the Gemara derive that a permanent nazirite cuts his hair every thirty days based upon the *halakha* that applies to a priest, rather than deriving this *halakha* directly from its source, which is the case of an unspecified term of naziriteship?

Tosafot answer that Rabbi Nehorai preferred to derive the *halakha* of a permanent nazirite from the case of a priest, whose sanctity is also permanent, rather than from the temporary sanctity of an ordinary nazirite. Other commentaries explain that this *halakha* cannot be derived from a regular nazirite, since he cuts his hair only because his term of naziriteship is completed. Rabbi Nehorai must derive the *halakha* from the case of priests, who cut their hair every month despite the fact that they retain their sanctity for longer than a month (Rosh; Rabbeinu Peretz; Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*). Another reason given is that cutting the hair of a permanent nazirite resembles cutting the hair of a priest, since neither of them entirely shave off their hair. A regular nazirite, however, must shave his entire head (Rabbeinu Todros, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*).

מאי איכא ביניה לשאר אחוהי – What difference is there between Absalom and the rest of his brothers – *Tosafot* point out that there is an obvious difference between them, as only

Absalom was required to bring offerings when he cut his hair. They answer that this question is referring to a difference with regard to cutting hair, as the Torah indicates that Absalom grew his hair longer than most people grew their hair. The Rosh notes that there were other differences even in the manner in which they were permitted to cut their hair, as Absalom was permitted to use only a razor while they were permitted to use scissors. Furthermore, he was allowed only to trim his hair, whereas they were allowed to cut it all off if they so desired. He explains that the Gemara is referring to his brothers' usual manner of cutting their hair, since they customarily used a razor and did not cut off all their hair. With regard to the observation of *Tosafot*, that an obvious difference is that only Absalom brought offerings when he cut his hair, the Rosh and Rabbeinu Azriel explain that when the Gemara states that Absalom was permitted to cut his hair only in the evening, it means to say that he was permitted to cut his hair only if he had already brought his offerings.

HALAKHA

Unspecified naziriteship lasts for thirty days – קַתֵּם נְזִירוּת – שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם: One who takes a nazirite vow without further specification becomes a nazirite for thirty days (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:1).

PERSONALITIES

Rav Mattana – רב מתנא: Rav Mattana was among the second generation of *amora'im* in Babylonia. He was one of the important disciples of Shmuel, as we find his teacher asking him for help understanding a certain point. Rav Mattana also quotes teachings in the name of Rav. For a while he lived in the city of Paponya, where he occupied himself with the dissemination of Torah. Third-generation *amora'im* quote halakhic and aggadic teachings in his name, and there are also teachings in his name in the *midrashim* from Eretz Yisrael.

Bar Padda – בר פדא: Bar Padda is the Sage Rabbi Yehuda bar Pedaiah, the son of bar Kappara's sister. He was among Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's younger disciples. Rabbi Yehuda bar Pedaiah was among the Sages of the South, living in the region of Judea. He may have lived in the town of Lod. All of the great second- and third-generation *amora'im* in Eretz Yisrael studied under his tutelage, and some of his teachings are quoted by Sages such as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, Rabbi Yohanan, and Reish Lakish. His contributions to *halakha* and *aggada* are found throughout both the Babylonian Talmud and the Jerusalem Talmud and in *midrashim*.

LANGUAGE

Numerical value [gimatriyya] – גמטריא: Derived from the Greek *γεωμετρία, geometria*, which means measurement or calculation in general, although the term was later designated for a specific type of calculation, geometry. In rabbinic literature, it also refers to mathematical calculations in general, although it most commonly refers to tabulating the numerical values of the letters in a word.

יום טוב שחל להיות באמצע שבת, דאחזיה מגלחין, הוא לא מגלח. אי נמי, לגלחי מן צפרא דמעלי שבתא; אחיה מגלחין, איהו לא מגלח עד פנאי.

הני ארבעים שנה מאי עבידתיהו? רבי נהוראי אומר משום רבי יהושע: לקץ ארבעים שנה ששאלו להן מלך. תנא: אותה שנה ששאלו להן מלך היא שנת עשר לשמואל הרמתי.

מתני' קתם נזירות שלשים יום.

גמ' מנהני מילי? אמר רב מתנא: אמר קרא "קדוש יהיה". "יהיה" בגמטריא תלתין הוו.

בר פדא אמר: כנגד "נזיר", "נזרו" האמורים בתורה, שלשים חסר אחת.

ורב מתנא נמי, גלף מ'נזיר" "נזרו"!

The Gemara answers: There is a difference between them with regard to a Festival that occurs in the middle of the week, as his brothers would cut their hair in honor of the Festival, whereas he would not cut his hair. Alternatively, the difference between them concerns cutting hair on the morning of Shabbat eve. His brothers would cut their hair at that hour, whereas he would not cut his hair until the evening, shortly before Shabbat.

Having mentioned in 4b the verse “and it came to pass at the end of forty years, that Absalom said unto the king” (II Samuel 15:7), the Gemara asks: With regard to these forty years, what is their purpose in this discussion,ⁿ i.e., to what time period do they refer? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Nehorai says in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: It is referring to the end of forty years, since the Jewish people requested for themselves a kingⁿ in the days of Samuel (see I Samuel, chapter 8). It was taught: That year when they requested for themselves a king was the tenth year of the leadership of Samuel the Ramathite.

MISHNA In the case of unspecified naziriteship, where one does not state how long he wishes to be a nazirite, the term lasts for thirty days.^h

GEMARA The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived,ⁿ that an unspecified naziriteship is thirty days? In answer to this question, Rav Mattana^p said: The verse states with regard to a nazirite: “He shall be [yihye] holy” (Numbers 6:5), and the numerical value [gimatriyya]^l of the letters of the word *yihye*ⁿ is thirty.

Bar Padda^p said: The number of days of an unspecified naziriteship corresponds to the number of appearances of the words “nazirite,” “his naziriteship,”ⁿ and similar terms that are stated in the Torah in the chapter of naziriteship (Numbers, chapter 6): Thirty less one times. So too, an unspecified term of naziriteship is twenty-nine days.

The Gemara asks: And Rav Mattana should also derive from the number of times that the words “nazirite” and “his naziriteship” appear, to conclude like bar Padda that an unspecified naziriteship lasts for twenty-nine days.

NOTES

These forty years, what is their purpose in this discussion – הני ארבעים שנה מאי עבידתיהו: The verse cannot mean forty years from the start of David's reign, since David reigned for a total of only forty years, and it is clear that he continued to reign for a few years after Absalom's rebellion (see II Samuel, chapter 21). The *tanna'im* in *Seder Olam* disagree about the precise date of the rebellion. The Gemara in tractate *Temura* (14b–15a) states that David had reigned for thirty-seven years before Absalom's rebellion, but the early commentaries cite manuscripts of that Gemara that state that he had reigned for thirty-six years (see Commentary on *Nazir* and *Tosafot*).

Requested for themselves a king – ששאלו להן מלך: The verse mentions this date because Absalom knew that his father was destined to reign for forty years, as he did, but he mistakenly thought that these forty years should be counted from the inception of the monarchy among the Jewish people (Commentary on *Nazir*). Other early commentaries explain that the Jewish people's request for a king constituted a rebellion against God, or a rebellion against the rule of Samuel the prophet, who served as a judge over the Jewish people. Consequently, the verse links Absalom's revolt with the original rebellion of the Jewish people (Rosh; Rabbeinu Peretz). Alternatively, the

verse dates the rebellion against the king from the time of the inception of the institution of Jewish monarchy (Rabbeinu Peretz, citing *Tosafot*).

From where are these matters derived – מנהני מילי: Only Rav Mattana provides an answer to the Gemara's question, since bar Padda's opinion that an unspecified term of naziriteship is twenty-nine days contradicts the *halakha* stated in the mishna. Other explanations of the mishna's ruling are offered in the Jerusalem Talmud. One explanation links the *yamim* stated with regard to a nazirite to the *yamim* stated in the context of a beautiful captive woman (Deuteronomy 21:13), which refers to thirty days. Alternatively, it might be derived from the verse that states with regard to a nazirite: “On the day when the days of his consecration are complete” (Numbers 6:13), since only a month can be called “complete” in days, and a month can be either thirty or twenty-nine days in the Jewish calendar (see 6b).

The numerical value of the letters of the word *yihye* – יהיה: In the Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna, it is explained that according to Rav Mattana, this *halakha* is learned through a tradition transmitted to Moses from Sinai, and he is merely providing support for it with a hint from the word's numerical value. The Rosh likewise explains that this

proof is merely a support, since calculating the numerical value of words is not included in the list of the thirteen exegetical principles through which *halakhot* are derived from the Torah. It is only one of the thirty-two exegetical principles that Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei, uses to learn *aggada*. See Rabbi Yoshiya's comments cited in the Gemara on 6b.

Nazirite, his naziriteship, etc. – נזיר, נזרו וכי' – It is explained in the Commentary on *Nazir* that this list includes not only the words “nazirite” and “his naziriteship,” but also the terms “vow” and “his vow” whenever they appear in this chapter. The full list of these terms is mentioned in the Commentary on *Nazir* and in greater detail in the Meiri. These terms actually appear thirty times in the chapter, but the verse “because his consecration [nezer] to God is upon his head” (Numbers 6:7) is not included in the list, since its meaning in context is crown and not naziriteship, as seen in the *Targum Onkelos* (Commentary on *Nazir; Tosafot*). The fact that these terms appear thirty times is also raised in the Jerusalem Talmud, where it is explained that one usage of the term nazirite is needed in order to state that the chapter is referring to a nazirite, and all of the other times that it appears are to teach the length of an unspecified term of naziriteship.

That one vow of naziriteship takes effect where another vow of naziriteship already exists – **שְׁהֵנְיוֹרוֹת חֻלָּה עַל הַנְּזִירִית**: One who takes two nazirite vows must observe a term of naziriteship for thirty days, whereupon he cuts his hair, brings his offerings, and then proceeds with his second term of naziriteship. This is the case whether he declared his two vows on one occasion or at separate times (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:6; 10).

אָמַר לָךְ: הֵיאָה לְדַרְשָׁה: "מִיִּין וְשִׁכְרִי וַיִּיר" – לְאַסּוֹר יַיִן מִצְוָה בֵּינֵי רְשׁוֹת. "כִּי יִפְלֵא לְגַדּוֹר נְזִיר לְהִייר" – מְלַמֵּד שְׁהֵנְיוֹרוֹת חֻלָּה עַל נְזִירוֹת.

The Gemara answers: Rav Mattana could have said to you: **That word is needed for a specific exposition.** The words: "**He shall abstain [yazir] from wine and strong drink**" (Numbers 6:3), comes to prohibit a nazirite from drinking wine that is consumed for a mitzva just as he is prohibited from drinking wine whose consumption is optional. Likewise, the words: "When either man or woman shall clearly utter a vow, the vow of a nazirite, to consecrate himself" (Numbers 6:2), teach that one vow of naziriteship takes effect where another vow of naziriteship already exists.^h For example, if one takes a vow by stating: I will be a nazirite today, and then repeats the vow, he must observe two periods of naziriteship. Consequently, since sometimes the word nazirite, in its different forms, appears in order to serve as the source of a particular exposition, the number of times it occurs does not indicate the length of an unspecified term of naziriteship.

Perek I

Daf 5 Amud b

וְבַר פְּדָא אָמַר לָךְ: לֵיכָא חַד מִיְהוֹן דְּלָאוּ לְדַרְשָׁא? אֲלָא, מִדְּהֵיאָה לְמַנְיָא – בּוֹלְהוּ נְמִי לְמַנְיָא.

And bar Padda could have said to you that although some of these verses are required for an exposition, is **there not at least one of themⁿ that is not used for an exposition?** Rather, since that usage of the term nazirite is stated to indicate the number of days in an unspecified term of naziriteship, **all of the other usages of the term are also stated to indicate the number of daysⁿ** in an unspecified term of naziriteship in addition to the specific *halakhot* that are derived from them.

תַּנֵּן: סַתָּם נְזִירוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם. בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַב מִתְנָא – נִיחָא, אֲלָא לְבַר פְּדָא קִשְׁיָא!

The Gemara analyzes the opinions of Rav Mattana and bar Padda in light of the mishna and relevant *baraitot*. **We learned in the mishna: An unspecified naziriteship lasts for thirty days. Granted, according to Rav Mattana it works out well. However, according to bar Padda it is difficult,** since in his opinion the mishna should have stated that an unspecified naziriteship lasts for twenty-nine days.

אָמַר לָךְ בַּר פְּדָא: אֵיִיִדִי דְאֵיכָא יוֹם תְּלָתִין, דְּמַגְלַח וּמְבִיא קֶרְבָּנוֹתָיו – מִשּׁוּם חֲכִי תַנָּא שְׁלֹשִׁים.

The Gemara answers: **Bar Padda could have said to you:** The principal days of naziriteship are twenty-nine days. However, **since there is the thirtieth day, when the nazirite shaves his hair and brings his offerings,** and the prohibitions of naziriteship remain in effect on that day until he has brought these offerings, **due to that reason the tanna teaches that an unspecified naziriteship lasts for thirty days.**

תַּנֵּן: מִי שְׂאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר" – מְגַלַּח יוֹם שְׁלֹשִׁים וְאֶחָד. בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַב מִתְנָא – נִיחָא, אֲלָא לְבַר פְּדָא קִשְׁיָא!

The Gemara asks: **We learned in a mishna (16a): One who said: I am hereby a nazirite, shaves his hair on the thirty-first day. Granted, according to Rav Mattana this works out well,** since one must finish his term of naziriteship, which lasts for thirty days, before he can shave his hair. **However, according to bar Padda, it is difficult.** Why doesn't he shave his hair on the thirtieth day?

אָמַר לָךְ בַּר פְּדָא, אֵימָא סִיפָא: אִם גִּילַח לְיוֹם שְׁלֹשִׁים – יִצָּא. אֲלָא סִיפָא מְסִיעָא לֵיהּ, רִישָׁא – נַעֲשֶׂה כְּאֹמְרֵי "שְׁלִימִין".

The Gemara answers: **Bar Padda could have said to you in response: Say the latter clause of that mishna: If he shaved his hair on the thirtieth day, he has fulfilled his obligation.** This indicates that the naziriteship itself lasts only twenty-nine days. **Rather, the latter clause of that mishna certainly supports his opinion.** As for the **first clause,** the reason a nazirite must wait until the thirty-first day in order to shave his hair *ab initio* is as follows: Since one who specifies that he is becoming a nazirite for thirty complete days may shave his hair only on the thirty-first day, the Sages ruled that even one who did not specify a time period **becomes like one who said explicitly that he will be a nazirite for thirty complete days.**ⁿ Consequently, he may shave his hair *ab initio* only after thirty days have passed.

NOTES

Is there not at least one of them – **לֵיכָא חַד מִיְהוֹן**: Although *halakhot* are derived from some occurrences of the words nazirite and naziriteship, there is at least one occurrence that does not teach any *halakha*, and it can therefore be assumed that just as that word presumably appears in order to teach the number of days in a period of unspecified naziriteship, even the words that serve as the source of other *halakhot* also indicate the length of an unspecified naziriteship (*Tosafot*). Rabbeinu Peretz explains that since the expositions for all of the terms are not known, it is unreasonable to assume that all the words are used for derivations but those derivations are not currently known. It is far more plausible to assume that some of these words appear in order to indicate the number of days in an unspecified naziriteship. It is also impossible to count only the superfluous words, since one or more of them might be expounded in a manner unknown to us. Therefore, all the words must be included.

All of the other usages of the term are also stated to indicate the number of days – **בוֹלְהוּ נְמִי לְמַנְיָא**: Similar disputes are recorded elsewhere (see *Sukka* 6b) with regard to the question of whether a word in the Torah that is needed to convey a *halakha* through its straightforward meaning can also be counted along with other, seemingly unnecessary usages of the word, so that the total number of times the word appears can be used to teach a *halakha*.

Becomes like one who said explicitly that he will be a nazirite for thirty complete days – **נַעֲשֶׂה כְּאֹמְרֵי שְׁלִימִין**: Nevertheless, since he himself did not say that he was accepting naziriteship for thirty complete days, if he shaves his hair on the thirtieth day, he fulfills his obligation (Commentary on *Nazir*). *Tosafot* and the Rosh explain that according to bar Padda, who does not accept the principle that part of the day is like the entire day, even if one said that he is accepting naziriteship for thirty days, and he did not specify thirty complete days, he may shave his hair only on the thirty-first day by Torah law. The Gemara mentions the case of one who said he will be a nazirite for thirty complete days only so that it can give the same answer on behalf of Rav Mattana in the continuation of this discussion.

The Rosh explains that the reason for the rabbinic decree is that people are more accustomed to using round numbers, such as thirty, rather than twenty-nine. Similarly, the Torah speaks of forty lashes and counting fifty days of the *omer*, although the precise number is one less than that (*Leket HaKotzerim*). Consequently, people are likely to accept thirty-day terms of naziriteship. In order to avoid confusion, the Sages decreed that anyone who accepts an unspecified term of naziriteship or a twenty-nine-day term must observe a thirty-day term of naziriteship (see Commentary on *Nazir*).

The legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day – **מקצת היום ככולו** – With regard to various *halakhot*, the legal status of part of a day is like that of an entire day. For example, with regard to the seventh day of mourning, once the mourner has observed the *halakhot* of mourning for the beginning of the day, it is as though he observed them for the entire day. He is not required to observe the *halakhot* of mourning for the duration of the day. The same is true with regard to the single day of mourning that must be observed when one receives the news that his relative died more than thirty days earlier (Rambam *Sefer Shofetim, Hilkhot Evel* 7:2–3, 10:5; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 402:1, 6).

וְלָרַב מִתְּנָא קְשׂוּיָא סִיפָא! קְסָבֵר: מְקַצֵּת הַיּוֹם כְּכֹלּוֹ.

The Gemara asks: **And for Rav Mattana, the latter clause of the mishna is difficult**, since it states that one who shaves his hair on the thirtieth day has fulfilled his obligation, whereas Rav Mattana claims that his naziriteship is not yet complete at that time. The Gemara answers: He holds that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day.^{HN} Although the term of naziriteship is thirty days, once the thirtieth day begins it is as though it has been completed, and a nazirite who shaves his hair on that day has fulfilled his obligation.

תַּנּוּ: "הֲרֵינִי נָזִיר שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם." אִם גִּילַח יוֹם שְׁלֹשִׁים – לֹא יֵצֵא! בְּאוֹמַר "שְׁלִימִין".

The Gemara asks further: **We learned in that same mishna: In the case of one who says: I am hereby a nazirite for thirty days, if he shaved his hair on the thirtieth day, he has not fulfilled his obligation.** This appears to contradict the opinion of Rav Mattana, who holds that part of the day is like an entire day. The Gemara answers: This is referring to one who says that he will be a nazirite for thirty complete days,^N in which case he certainly does not fulfill his obligation by shaving his hair on the thirtieth day itself.

תַּנּוּ: מִי שְׁנִיר שְׁתֵּי נְזִירוֹת, מְגַלַּח אֶת הָרֵאשׁוֹנָה יוֹם שְׁלֹשִׁים וְאַחַד, וְהַשְּׁנִיָּה לְיוֹם שְׁשִׁים וְאַחַד. בְּשִׁלְמָא לָרַב מִתְּנָא – נִיחָא.

The Gemara asks further: **We learned in that mishna: One who accepted two terms of naziriteship^N shaves his hair for the first naziriteship on the thirty-first day, and he shaves his hair for the second term on the sixty-first day. Granted, according to Rav Mattana this works out well,^N since he shaves his head for the first naziriteship after a full thirty days have passed. The second term of naziriteship then commences on that day, which is the thirty-first day since he took his vows. He then shaves for the second time on the thirty-first day of his second naziriteship, which is the sixty-first day since he took his vows.**

NOTES

The legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day – מקצת היום ככולו – The commentaries ask: Since bar Padda and Rav Mattana agree that the nazirite must cut his hair on the thirty-first day *ab initio* but if he did so on the thirtieth day he has fulfilled his obligation, what is the practical difference between their opinions?

Rabbeinu Peretz explains that there is no need to find a practical difference, as they are merely arguing over the source of the *halakha*. Other commentaries explain that they differ with regard to a nazirite who became impure on the thirtieth day before bringing his offerings. According to bar Padda, he does not negate the days of his naziriteship since he became impure after the completion of his term, whereas Rav Mattana holds that he must start his naziriteship anew (Commentary on *Nazir*). Alternatively, bar Padda holds that he must start his naziriteship again by rabbinic law, whereas Rav Mattana holds that he must begin his naziriteship anew by Torah law. Additionally, they disagree with regard to one who explicitly stated that he will be a nazirite for twenty-nine days. According to bar Padda, in this case he may cut his hair on the thirtieth day *ab initio*, whereas according to Rav Mattana this is a case of one who takes a nazirite vow for a shorter period than the minimum amount, and he must complete the thirty days (Commentary on *Nazir*).

Tosafot add another difference: Since they disagree about whether the legal status of part of a day is like that of the entire day, in any case where one specifies a term of naziriteship of a particular number of days, Rav Mattana holds that one can shave his hair on the last day of that term and bar Padda holds that one must wait until the following day. It should be noted that an opinion is cited in the Jerusalem Talmud that claims that according to Rav Mattana, one who takes upon himself an unspecified

term of naziriteship and cuts his hair on the thirtieth day has not fulfilled his obligation.

This is referring to one who says that he will be a nazirite for thirty complete days – באומר שלימין: Since he said so explicitly, he does not fulfill his obligation if he cuts his hair earlier (Commentary on *Nazir*). *Tosafot* explain that the question cited here in the Gemara does not present a difficulty for the opinion of bar Padda, because he holds that part of a day is not like an entire day. Consequently, since the individual specified that his term of naziriteship was to last thirty days, he did not fulfill his obligation if he shaved his hair on the thirtieth day.

Tosafot explain further that, according to Rav Mattana, even if the individual did not explicitly state that his term of naziriteship would last thirty complete days, that is implied by his statement that his term would last thirty days. Otherwise it would have been unnecessary for him to specify that his term was for thirty days, as an unspecified term of naziriteship is also thirty days. The Rosh cites an alternative version of the Gemara text that states: It is as though he said that his term would be thirty complete days.

Two terms of naziriteship – שתי נזירות: The Rosh explains simply that he said he is accepting upon himself two terms of naziriteship. Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*, claims that the same *halakha* applies to one who made two consecutive statements, such as: I am hereby a nazirite, I am a nazirite.

According to Rav Mattana this works out well – לרב מתנא ניחא: This is because he maintains that the thirty-first day from the beginning of the first naziriteship is the first day of the second term, and therefore on both occasions the nazirite shaves his hair on the thirty-first day (Commentary on *Nazir*).