

מתני' "הריני נזיר כשער ראשי".
ו"כעפר הארץ" ו"כחול הים" – הרי זה
נזיר עולם, ומגלח אחת לשלשים יום.

רבי אומר: אין זה מגלח אחת לשלשים
יום. ואיזהו מגלח אחת לשלשים –
האומר "הרי עלי נזירות כשער ראשי",
ו"כעפר הארץ" ו"כחול הים".

"הריני נזיר מלא הבית" או "מלא
הקופה" – בודקין אותו. אם אמר:
אחת גדולה נזרתי – נזיר שלשים
יום. ואם אמר: סתם נזרתי – רואין
את הקופה כאילו היא מלאה חרדל,
ונזיר כל ימיו.

MISHNA If one says: I am hereby a nazirite like the
hair of my head,^H or: Like the dust of the
earth, or: Like the sand of the sea, he is a nazirite forever. He has
accepted a separate term of naziriteship for every hair or particle of
dust or sand, which in practice means that he will be a nazirite forever.
And he shaves his hair once every thirty days.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: This nazirite does not shave his hair
once every thirty days,^N as he has accepted upon himself one long
term of naziriteship lasting for as many days as there are hairs or
particles of dust or sand. And who is the nazirite who shaves his hair
once every thirty days? One who says: It is hereby incumbent upon
me to observe naziriteships like the hair of my head, or: Like the
dust of the earth, or: Like the sand of the sea. Since he used the
plural term naziriteships, it is clear that he is accepting distinct terms
of naziriteship.

If one says: I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the capacity
of the house,^{HN} or: The capacity of the basket, one checks with
him^N what he had in mind. If he said: My intention was to take a
nazirite vow for one long term of naziriteship, he is a nazirite for
only thirty days, in accordance with the ruling of the mishna that
the words long or short are of no account when used in a nazirite vow
(7a). And if he said: I took a nazirite vow without specification,^N
it is assumed that he meant to accept upon himself terms of nazirite-
ship corresponding to the number of items that fit into the basket,
and the smallest items normally placed in baskets are used for
this evaluation. Consequently, one views the basket as though it
were full of mustard^B seeds, which are extremely small, and he is a
nazirite for his entire life.

BACKGROUND

Mustard – תרדל: Mustard is produced from several plants, includ-
ing the white mustard plant, *Sinapis nigra*, and the black mustard
plant, *Brassica nigra*. Often, seeds from different plants are mixed
together. These plants all come from the Brassicaceae family and
grow wild in Eretz Yisrael. Black mustard has tangled branches
and grows in bunches of large, crowded flowers. The condiment
mustard is produced from its seeds. Black mustard is the largest
plant in the Brassicaceae family, normally reaching anywhere
from 0.5–2 m in height, and in some uncommon cases growing
to up to 5 m. Mustard seeds are small, around 1.5–2 mm in width,
and they are therefore used as an example of something very
small, as in the Gemara here.



Above: White mustard plant
Left: Black mustard plant



Seeds of black and white mustard plants

HALAKHA

I am hereby a nazirite like the hair of my head, etc. –
הריני נזיר כשער ראשי וכו': One who says: I am hereby a
nazirite like the hair of my head, or: Like the dust of the
earth, is considered to have accepted upon himself terms
of naziriteship corresponding to the number of hairs on
his head. He must therefore shave his hair and bring
offerings every thirty days for the rest of his life (Rambam
Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut 3:18).

I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the capacity
of the house, etc. – הריני נזיר מלא הבית וכו': If one says:
I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the capacity
of the house, or: In accordance with the capacity of the
basket, he is asked to clarify what he meant. If he explains
that he meant to accept one term of naziriteship, he is a
nazirite for thirty days. If he says he vowed to be a nazirite
without any specific intention, the basket is seen as
though it were full of mustard seeds, and consequently
he is a nazirite forever and cuts his hair once every twelve
months. This is in accordance with the decision cited in
the Jerusalem Talmud (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot
Nezirut* 3:17).

NOTES

This nazirite does not shave his hair once every thirty
days – אין זה מגלח אחת לשלשים יום: The commentaries
disagree as to the status of this individual according to
Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Some say he has the status of a
permanent nazirite, who trims his hair and brings offer-
ings once every twelve months (Rambam's Commentary
on the Mishna; Meiri). This is the explanation cited in the
Jerusalem Talmud. Others maintain that according to
Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, his status is like one who accepts
a one-hundred-year term of naziriteship (see 7a), and he
may never cut his hair (Commentary on *Nazir*; *Tosafot*;
Rosh).

The capacity of the house – מלא הבית: The refers to the
capacity of a house or a basket that is currently empty
(*Tosafot*). If the house or basket was filled with items, he
would be obligated to observe a term of naziriteship for
each item in the house or basket.

One checks with him, etc. – בודקים אותו וכו': Rabbeinu
Todros, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*, asks why one checks
with the individual in this case but not in the first case
in the mishna, where one accepted naziriteship like the
hairs of his head. Is it not possible that in the earlier case
as well, one intended to accept a single term of nazirite-
ship that seemed large and daunting to him? He answers
that a basket is a single unit, and therefore the intention
must be clarified. Conversely, the hairs on one's head
are many separate units, and therefore one who uses
this language has accepted many terms of naziriteship.

I took a nazirite vow without specification – סתם נזרתי:
The Rosh explains that he says that he had no particular
intention in mind and relied on the Sages to clarify his
statement (see *Tosefot Yom Tov*).

I am hereby a nazirite from here until such and such a place – הָרִינִי נְזִיר מִכָּאן עַד מְקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי – If one said: I am hereby a nazirite from here until such and such a place, if he has not yet set out on his way, then he is a nazirite for thirty days. If he has set out on his journey and the place is less than thirty days' walk away, he is a nazirite for thirty days. If the place is farther away than that, he observes one term of naziriteship lasting as long as the number of days of travel remaining on his journey. This is in accordance with the explanation cited in the Gemara on 7a (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 3:5).

I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the number of days in a solar year – הָרִינִי נְזִיר כְּמִנְיַן יָמוֹת הַחֲמֵה – If one says: I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the number of days in a year, he must observe 354 terms of naziriteship, each lasting thirty days. This corresponds to the number of days of a non-leap year in the Jewish calendar, as that is what people generally mean when they refer to a year. However, if one explicitly referred to a solar year, he must observe 365 terms of naziriteship (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 3:7).

On the condition that this pile will be found to contain one hundred kor – עַל מְנַת שִׂיחָא בְּכָרִי זֶה מֵאָה כּוֹר – If one says: I am a nazirite if this pile will be found to contain at least one hundred kor, and it turns out that the pile has been stolen or lost and cannot be measured, he is not a nazirite. A case of uncertain naziriteship is treated leniently, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 2:9).

הָרִינִי נְזִיר מִכָּאן עַד מְקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי – אֲזוּמָדִין בְּכַמֵּה יָמִים מִכָּאן עַד מְקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי, אִם פָּחוֹת מִשְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם – נְזִיר שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם, וְאִם לָאוּ – נְזִיר כְּמִנְיַן הַיָּמִים.

הָרִינִי נְזִיר כְּמִנְיַן יָמוֹת הַחֲמֵה – מִנְה נְזִירוֹת כְּמִנְיַן יָמוֹת הַחֲמֵה. אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: מִעֲשָׂה הִיא, בֵּין שְׁהִשְׁלִים – יָמֵת.

גַּמ' רֹזְאִין אֶת הַקּוּפָה בְּאֵילוּ מְלֵאָה חֲרָדְל וְנִיר בֵּל יִמְיוֹ. וְאִמְאִי? וְלִיתְחִיָּה בְּאֵילוּ מְלֵאָה קִישׁוּאִין וְדְלוּעִין, וְתִהְיוּ לֵיהּ תִּקְנָתָא!

אָמַר חֲזַקְיָה: בְּמַחְלֻקַת שְׁנַיִה, וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן הִיא, דְּאָמַר: אֲדָם מְכַנֵּס אֶת עֲצָמוֹ לְדַבֵּר שְׁפִיקוֹ חֲמוֹר מוֹדָאִי.

דִּתְנֵינָא: הָרִינִי נְזִיר עַל מְנַת שִׂיחָא בְּכָרִי זֶה מֵאָה כּוֹר" וְהֵלֵךְ וּמְצָאוּ שְׁנַנְבֵּ אוֹ שְׂאֵבֵד, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹסֵר, שְׁפִיק נְזִירוֹת לְהַחְמִיר.

If one says: I am hereby a nazirite from here until such and such a place,^h one estimates how many days it takes to walk from here until such and such a place. If it is less than thirty days, he is a nazirite for thirty days, since this is the minimum term of naziriteship. And if not, i.e., if it takes more than thirty days to walk that distance, he is a nazirite in accordance with the number of days it takes to walk to that place.

If one says: I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the number of days in a solar year,^h he counts 365 consecutive naziriteships, in accordance with the number of days in a solar year. Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident where someone took this vow and observed 365 consecutive terms of naziriteship. Once he completed all these terms of naziriteship, he died.ⁿ

GEMARA The mishna taught that if one said: I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the capacity of the basket, and he did not specifically intend to accept one term of naziriteship, one views the basket as though it were full of mustard seeds, and he is a nazirite for his entire life. The Gemara asks: But why does one view the basket as though it were full of mustard seeds? Let us view it as though it were full of cucumbersⁿ or gourds, which are much larger. The basket would consequently hold fewer of them, and there would be a remedy for him, i.e., he would be able to complete his terms of naziriteship and resume living as a non-nazirite.

In response to this question, Hizkiyya said: This issue is taught as a dispute between *tanna'im*, and the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who said: A person places himselfⁿ in a state where the resulting uncertainty is more stringent than if there were certainty,ⁿ i.e., an individual willingly accepts conditions that are ambiguous although this may cause him to have to keep more stringent *halakhot* if the uncertainty is not clarified.

This is as it is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to one who says: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that this pile of grain will be found to contain at least one hundred kor,^h and he went to measure the pile and found that it was stolenⁿ or lost, making it impossible to determine whether it contained one hundred kor, Rabbi Shimon prohibits him to drink wine or cut his hair, as he holds that in a case of uncertain naziriteship one is required to act stringently. Similarly, in the case in the mishna, since it is not known whether one intended to accept naziriteship according to the number of mustard seeds in the basket or according to the number of gourds there, he must act stringently.

NOTES

Once he completed all these terms of naziriteship he died – בֵּין שְׁהִשְׁלִים מַת: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is cited in the Jerusalem Talmud as explaining that the individual was blessed with a long life so that he could complete his terms of naziriteship.

As though it were full of cucumbers – בְּאֵילוּ מְלֵאָה קִישׁוּאִין: *Tosafot* point out that the Gemara could have said: Full of dough, or any other substance that would fill the basket entirely. They explain that since the mishna mentioned mustard seeds, the Gemara gives an example involving larger produce, but the question allows for the possibility that one be obligated in only one term of naziriteship as well (see *Keren Ora*).

A person places himself, etc. – אֲדָם מְכַנֵּס אֶת עֲצָמוֹ וכו': Naziriteship is accepted with a vow, and there is a principle with regard to vows that when the vow is expressed ambiguously, it is interpreted based upon the intentions of the individual who took the vow. The dispute between Rabbi Shimon and Rabbi Yehuda is about whether the speaker meant to take the vow even when it was impossible to determine some details pertaining to the vow, and this lack of certainty entails stringency, or if it is assumed that he certainly did not intend to accept the vow under these circumstances. In the *Tosefta*, it is explained

that they differ with regard to whether one who unwittingly takes a nazirite vow must observe naziriteship. Rabbi Shimon maintains that such a naziriteship takes effect, whereas Rabbi Yehuda believes that a mistaken naziriteship does not take effect.

Where the resulting uncertainty is more stringent than if there were certainty – שְׁפִיקוֹ חֲמוֹר מוֹדָאִי: One explanation of this phrase, as it applies to the case in the mishna, is that the stringency arises because of the ambiguous statement. Had he been clearer, he would be obligated to be a nazirite only for the duration that he explicitly stated (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar). However, most early commentaries explain that since it is unclear how many terms of naziriteship he intended to accept, once he has completed terms of naziriteship corresponding to the number of cucumbers or gourds that could fit into the house or basket, he has the status of an uncertain nazirite. The *halakhot* that apply to an uncertain nazirite are more stringent than those that apply to one who definitely accepted terms of naziriteship according to the number of mustard seeds that can fit into the house or basket. If he was a definite nazirite, he would shave his hair and bring offerings every thirty days. An uncertain nazirite can never shave his hair, due to the prohibition against rounding off the corners of the head, which he

would transgress if he was not really a nazirite (Meiri). He is also unable to bring the offerings of a nazirite, in case he is not a nazirite and will thereby be bringing non-consecrated animals into the Temple courtyard. He cannot even bring the offerings on a voluntary basis since they include a sin-offering, which cannot be brought on a voluntary basis.

And he went and found that it was stolen – וְהֵלֵךְ וּמְצָאוּ שְׁנַנְבֵּ: In this case, the individual's uncertain status as a nazirite requires him to act more stringently than if he were certainly a nazirite. Due to the possibility that he is not a nazirite, he cannot bring the offerings a nazirite must bring at the conclusion of his term of naziriteship. However, due to the possibility that he is a nazirite, he cannot cut his hair or drink wine without having brought the offerings. Therefore, he must refrain from cutting his hair and drinking wine indefinitely. The solution for such an individual is to state: If I am not a nazirite due to my previous statement, I hereby accept naziriteship. That would cause him to certainly be a nazirite, and thirty days later he may bring the offerings and conclude his naziriteship. However, if he became impure due to a corpse before he made the second statement, he cannot bring the offerings of an impure nazirite and must observe the restrictions of naziriteship indefinitely (*Tosafot*; Rosh).

He does not necessarily even enter a state of naziriteship – לֹא נִחִית לִיה לְנִזְרוּת – Since it is uncertain whether or not he accepted naziriteship, he is not considered a nazirite. This is because it is assumed that he did not want to enter into naziriteship with an ambiguous statement (Rosh). Rabbeinu Peretz explains that the speaker merely stated his intention to clearly accept naziriteship upon measuring the pile. Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*, explains that since he was not yet a nazirite when he made his statement, he is presumed to maintain his prior status until it can be proven otherwise. In the case in the mishna, however, one certainly accepted naziriteship and the question pertains to the number of terms he accepted. Consequently, he must remain a nazirite until it is clear that his terms are complete.

It entered our minds, etc. – הָא סְלִקָא דְעֵתֵינוּ וְכוּ' – *Tosafot* and Rabbeinu Peretz explain that this sentence concludes the Gemara's question and is read as follows: Since the individual has accepted a separate term of naziriteship for each item that can fit into the house or basket, once he has observed a single term, he brings the offerings for concluding that term. At that point, since it is not clear whether he accepted additional terms, Rabbi Yehuda should exempt him from naziriteship, just as he is quoted in the *baraita* as exempting one who never clearly accepted naziriteship. According to this explanation, the wording of the Gemara at the beginning of the following page must be adjusted slightly. Alternatively, it is explained in the Commentary on *Nazir* that this statement is the start of the Gemara's answer and is read as follows: The speaker did not accept separate terms of naziriteship, as Rabbi Yehuda agrees with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi that he has accepted one long term of naziriteship. Consequently, since it is unclear when that term ends, he can never bring the offerings brought at the conclusion of naziriteship and he must observe the restrictions of naziriteship indefinitely. According to this explanation, the wording of the Gemara here must be adjusted slightly.

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה מְתִיר, שְׂפֵפֶק נְזִירוֹת לְהִקָּל.

Conversely, **Rabbi Yehuda permits** him to drink wine or cut his hair, as he holds that in a case of **uncertain naziriteship** one is permitted to act **leniently**. The naziriteship does not take effect, since the pile might have contained less than one hundred *kor*.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ תִּימָא רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, הָתָם – לֹא נִחִית לִיה לְנִזְרוּת, הֲכָא – נִחִית לִיה לְנִזְרוּת, בְּמֵאֵי לְסִלּוּקֵיהּ מִיָּנִיה!

Rabbi Yohanan said: You can even say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda** because the cases in the mishna and in the *baraita* are not comparable. **There**, in the case discussed in the *baraita*, **he does not** necessarily even enter a state of **naziriteship**,^N as it is unclear whether the pile contained a *kor* of grain. Consequently, he retains his previous status and is not considered a nazirite. Conversely, in the case discussed **here** in the mishna, **he certainly enters** a state of **naziriteship**, since he undoubtedly vowed to be a nazirite for some period of time. Consequently, **how** is it possible to **remove** the state of naziriteship **from him** when it is uncertain when his terms end? Therefore, even Rabbi Yehuda would agree that he remains a nazirite indefinitely.

אֲמַאי לָא? לִיחֻזְיָה לְקוּפָּה בְּאֵילוּ מְלֵאָה קִישׁוּאִין וְדְלוּעִין, וְתִיָּהוּי לִיה תְּקַנְתָּא, הָא סְלִקָא דְעֵתֵינוּ נְזִירוֹת הוּא דְקַבִּיל עֵילוּיָה!

The Gemara asks: **Why** is it **not** possible to remove from him the status of naziriteship? **Let us view the basket as though** it were **full of cucumbers or gourds**, as he has accepted at least as many terms of naziriteship as the number of cucumbers or gourds that can fit in the basket, **and in this way there will be a remedy for him**. **It entered our minds**^N to say that it is distinct **naziriteships that he accepted upon himself**, and so once he has completed the minimal number of naziriteships, he should no longer be considered a nazirite unless it can be determined that he accepted more than this number of terms of naziriteship.

Perek I

Daf 8 Amud b

דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סֵבֵר לָהּ כְּרַבִּי. דְּתַנְנָן, רַבִּי אֹמְרִי: אֵין זֶה מְגַלַּח אַחַת לְשָׁלְשִׁים יוֹם. וְאֵין הוּא שְׂמַגְלַח אַחַת לְשָׁלְשִׁים יוֹם – הָאוּמֵר [הֲרִי] עָלַי נְזִירוֹת בְּשַׁעַר רֵאשִׁי וְיִבְעַפֵּר הָאָרֶץ וְיִבְחוּל הַיָּם.

The Gemara answers: This is not possible, as **Rabbi Yehuda holds in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi**, as we learned in the mishna (8a) with regard to one who vows: I am hereby a nazirite like the hair of my head, **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says:** This nazirite **does not** shave his hair **once** every **thirty days**, as he is considered to have accepted one long term of naziriteship. **And who is** the nazirite **who** has accepted distinct terms of naziriteship and therefore **shaves** his hair **once** every **thirty days**? **One who says:** It is incumbent **upon me** to observe **naziriteships like the hair of my head, or: Like the dust of the earth, or: Like the sand of the sea**. Since Rabbi Yehuda agrees with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, he holds that one who uses a formulation similar to that used in the first case in the mishna and says: I am hereby a nazirite according to the capacity of the basket, has accepted one long term of naziriteship.

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מִי סֵבֵר לָהּ כְּרַבִּי? וְהִתְנַן: "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר כְּמִנְיַן יְמוֹת הַחֲמֵשׁ וְכוּ', אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: מַעֲשֵׂה הָיָה וּבִינָן שְׁהַשְּׁלִים מָת.

The Gemara asks: **And does Rabbi Yehuda hold in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi**? **But didn't we learn** in the mishna that if one says: **I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the number of days in a solar year**, he counts 365 consecutive naziriteships, in accordance with the number of days in a solar year. **Rabbi Yehuda said:** **There was an incident** where someone took this vow and observed 365 consecutive terms of naziriteship. **Once he completed** all these terms of naziriteship, **he died**.

Is there completion – מי הוי השלמה – It is explained in the Commentary on *Nazir* that according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the individual has not undertaken 365 terms of naziriteship, each of which lasts for thirty days. Rather, each term lasts for 365 days. Alternatively, the statement is understood to refer to one term of naziriteship for as long as the sun shines, i.e., forever. Either way, it is impossible for the individual to complete his term of naziriteship.

Other commentaries hold that, according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the individual has accepted one term of naziriteship lasting 365 days. Accordingly, the Rid explains that if Rabbi Yehuda agreed with this opinion he would not have noted that there was an incident in which an individual completed this term and then died, as one year is not a very long time. *Tosafot* and the Rosh explain that a mishna will typically cite an incident in support of a previously stated ruling. Consequently, Rabbi Yehuda's statement is understood to be providing support for the opinion of the first, anonymous *tanna*, who disagrees with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbeinu Peretz and an alternative answer of *Tosafot* claim that the word completion is unsuitable for a single term of naziriteship and applies only to one who vowed to observe several consecutive periods of naziriteship.

Sheaves of [*shibbolei*] the Sabbatical Year – שְׂבִילֵי שְׂמִיטָה: It is explained in the Commentary on *Nazir* that since fields are not sown in the Sabbatical Year, the only produce that grows are aftergrowths of plants from the previous year. Consequently, they grow in sparse patches that can be counted. However, most commentaries, e.g., the *Arukh*, had a text of the Gemara that included the word *shevilei*, paths, instead of *shibbolei*. According to this version, a consequence of the fact that fields are not sown in the seventh year is that their owners do not mind if people walk through them, which leads to the formation of many paths. This version of the text is also cited in the Commentary on *Nazir*.

אי אמרת בשלמא נזירות קא מקבל עליה – היינו טעמא דכיון דהשלים מת. אלא אי אמרת חדא נזירות קבל עליה – מי הוי השלמה כלל?

ועוד, מי סבר לה כרבי? והא תניא, רבי יהודה אומר: "הריני נזיר מנן הילקטי קיץ" ו"מנן שבלי שמיטה" – מונה נזירות כמנן הילקטי קיץ, וכמנן שבלי שמיטה.

"מנן" שאני.

ומי שאני ליה לרבי "מנן"? והתניא: "הריני נזיר כמנן ימות החמה" – מונה נזירות כמנן ימות החמה: "כימי הלבנה" – מונה כימי הלבנה, רבי אומר: עד שיאמר "נזירות עלי כמנן ימות החמה" ו"כמנן ימות הלבנה!"

The Gemara explains its question: **Granted, if you say that he accepts upon himself many naziriteships, that is the reason for his statement that once he completed all these terms of naziriteship he died. However, if you say that Rabbi Yehuda does not agree with the unattributed opinion of the mishna and holds that he accepted upon himself one term of naziriteship lasting 365 days, is there completionⁿ here at all?** Rabbi Yehuda would not have used this terminology in reference to the mishna's previous statement if he himself holds that the individual accepted only one term of naziriteship.

And furthermore, does Rabbi Yehuda hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? But isn't it taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda says: If one says: I am hereby a nazirite like the number of piles [*helketei*]^l of figs [*kayitz*]^l left to dry, or: Like the number of sheaves of the Sabbatical Year,ⁿ he must count as many naziriteships as the number of piles of figs or as the number of sheaves of the Sabbatical Year? This proves that Rabbi Yehuda does not hold that the individual accepts only one long term of naziriteship.

The Gemara responds: This does not prove that Rabbi Yehuda does not agree with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, since one who specifies: Like the number, is different, as even Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would agree that he is referring to distinct terms of naziriteship rather than one long term of naziriteship.

The Gemara asks: **And is the case of one who says: Like the number, different according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? But isn't it taught in a *baraita* that if one says: I am hereby a nazirite like the number of days in a solar year, he counts naziriteships corresponding to the number of days in a solar year. If one says: Like the days in a lunar year, i.e., a year comprised of twelve lunar months, he counts terms of naziriteship corresponding to the days in a lunar year. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: He is assumed to have accepted one term of naziriteship until he says: It is incumbent upon me to observe naziriteships like the number of days in a solar year, or: Like the number of days in a lunar year.** This demonstrates that if one did not explicitly use the plural term naziriteships, he is assumed to have accepted a single term of naziriteship even if he said: Like the number.

LANGUAGE

Piles [*helketei*] – הילקטי: There are many opinions as to the source of this word. Some assert that it comes from the Greek *ἑλικτός*, *heliktos*, meaning something bent and rounded, like a kind of bracket. According to this explanation, the term *helketei* is used here to refer to piles of figs left out to dry. Others claim that *helketei* is derived from the Greek *ὄλος*, *holos*, meaning a trail or path. Accordingly, the term is used here because when figs are laid out to dry they are arranged with paths between them in order to allow the owner to attend to the figs.

Figs [*kayitz*] – קיץ: A biblical word for figs that are left out to dry. The ends [*katzot*] of the figs were cut to allow some of the latex, the milky substance found in figs, to flow out, and then they were left in the sun to dry. Additionally, during the summer [*kayitz*], the fields were filled with mounds of drying figs.



Figs with dripping latex left out to dry

I am hereby a nazirite all the days of my life, etc. – הָרִינִי נְזִיר כָּל יְמֵי חַיִּי וְכוּ': If one says: I am hereby a nazirite all the days of my life, or: I am hereby a permanent nazirite, he becomes a permanent nazirite. If he stipulates a fixed time in his vow, he is a nazirite for that period of time, even if it is longer than the human life span (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 3:11).

I am hereby a nazirite and one, etc. – הָרִינִי נְזִיר וְאַחַת – וְכוּ': If one says: I am hereby a nazirite and one, he is obligated to observe two terms of naziriteship. If he says: I am hereby a nazirite and one and another, he is obligated to observe three terms of naziriteship, and if he adds: And again, he is a nazirite for four terms, as stated in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 3:8).

LANGUAGE

Digon, etc. – דִּיגוֹן וְכוּ': From the Greek δίγωνον, *digonon*, meaning having two sides, and related to δίγωνος, *digonos*, meaning again, another time. Similarly, τρίγωνον, *trigonon*, means a triangle, and τρίγωνος, *trigonos*, means a third time. *Tetragon* comes from the Greek τετράγωνον, *tetragonon*, meaning with four equal angles, rectangular, or square. *Puntigon* comes from the Greek πεντάγωνον, *pentagonon*, meaning five sided, and it is used here to mean a fifth time.

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבַר לָהּ כְּוִתִּיָּה בְּחֻדָּא, וּפְלִיג עֲלֵיהּ בְּחֻדָּא, סָבַר לָהּ כְּוִתִּיָּה בְּחֻדָּא – נְזִירוֹת קַבֵּיל עֵילוּיָהּ, וּפְלִיג עֲלֵיהּ בְּחֻדָּא – דְּאֵילוּ רַבִּי יְהוּדָה שָׁנִי לִיָּה מוֹנָה, וְרַבִּי לֹא שָׁנִי לִיָּה מוֹנָה.

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Yehuda holds in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion in one case and disagrees with him in one case. He holds in accordance with his opinion in one case, as follows:** If one says: I am hereby a nazirite like the hairs of my head, he has **accepted upon himself one term of naziriteship** for as many days as the number of hairs on his head. **And he disagrees with him in one case, as according to Rabbi Yehuda, the case of one who counts is different^N from the previous case, and so one who states:** Like the number of hairs of my head, is considered to have accepted many distinct terms of naziriteship. However, according to **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, one who counts is not different.** He is assumed to have accepted a single term of naziriteship unless he explicitly uses the plural term naziriteships.

תַּנּוּ רַבָּנַן: "הָרִינִי נְזִיר כָּל יְמֵי חַיִּי", "הָרִינִי נְזִיר עוֹלָם" – הָרִי זֶה נְזִיר עוֹלָם, אֶפְיִלוּ מֵאָה שָׁנָה אֶפְיִלוּ "אֶלֶף שָׁנִים" – אֵין זֶה נְזִיר עוֹלָם אֶלָּא נְזִיר לְעוֹלָם.

S The Sages taught: If one says: **I am hereby a nazirite all the days of my life,^H or: I am hereby a permanent nazirite, he is a permanent nazirite and he trims his hair on a yearly basis like Absalom.** However, in the case of one who accepts upon himself naziriteship for a fixed amount of time, **even if he says: One hundred years^N or even: One thousand years, he is not the specific type of nazirite known as a permanent nazirite. Rather, he is a regular nazirite forever, and he may never cut his hair.**

תַּנּוּ רַבָּנַן: "הָרִינִי נְזִיר וְאַחַת" – מוֹנָה שְׁתַּיִם. "וְעוֹד" – מוֹנָה שְׁלֹשׁ. "וְשׁוֹב" – מוֹנָה אַרְבַּע. פְּשִׁיטָא! מַהוּ דְתִימָא: "וְשׁוֹב" כִּי בּוֹלְהוּ, וְהוּא לִיָּה שִׁית, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן דְּלֵא.

S The Sages taught in a baraita: If one said: **I am hereby a nazirite and one,^H he counts two terms of naziriteship, since he first took a nazirite vow and then accepted an additional term of naziriteship.** If one said: I am hereby a nazirite and one **and more, he counts three terms of naziriteship.** If he added to that statement: **And again, he counts four.** The Gemara asks: **Isn't this last halakha obvious?** The Gemara answers: It is necessary to teach this *halakha*. **Lest you say that the words and again are referring to terms of naziriteship equal in number to all the terms^N he has already accepted, and he has therefore accepted six terms of naziriteship altogether, the baraita therefore teaches us that this is not the correct interpretation of his statement.**

תַּנּוּ רַבָּנַן: "הָרִינִי נְזִיר". סוּמְכּוֹס אֹמֵר: "הֵן" – אַחַת, "דִּיגוֹן" – שְׁתַּיִם, "טְרִיגוֹן" – שְׁלֹשׁ, "טְטְרִגוֹן" – אַרְבַּע, "פּוּנְטִיגוֹן" חֲמִישׁ.

The Sages taught in a baraita: If one said: **I am hereby a nazirite, Sumakhos says:** If he then added the word *hen*, which means one in Greek, he has accepted **one^N term of naziriteship.** If one said: *Digon*,^L which means two sides in Hebraicized Greek, he must observe **two terms of naziriteship.** If one said: *Trigon*, which means triangle in Hebraicized Greek, then he has accepted **three terms of naziriteship.** If he said: *Tetragon*, quadrilateral in Hebraicized Greek, then he has accepted **four terms, and if he said: Puntigon, pentagon in Hebraicized Greek, then he has accepted **five terms of naziriteship.****

NOTES

According to Rabbi Yehuda one who counts is different – רַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבַר לָהּ כְּוִתִּיָּה בְּחֻדָּא, וּפְלִיג עֲלֵיהּ בְּחֻדָּא: According to this explanation, there are three distinct opinions cited in the mishna: According to the Rabbis, one who takes a vow to be a nazirite by mentioning something that divides into a number of distinct units is obligated to observe terms of naziriteship corresponding to that number. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds that unless one explicitly mentions the plural term naziriteships, one who vows in this manner intends to observe a single term of naziriteship lasting as many days as those units. According to both these opinions, there is no difference whether or not the speaker mentions the word number. According to Rabbi Yehuda, if one mentions the word number, e.g., he says: Like the number of hairs of my head, he intends to accept separate terms of naziriteship. However, if he does not use this term he intends to accept a single term of naziriteship (see Rosh).

Even one hundred years – אֶפְיִלוּ מֵאָה שָׁנָה: Any fixed number is considered a single unit, and therefore this statement is an acceptance of a single term of naziriteship.

The words and again are referring to terms of naziriteship like all the terms – שׁוֹב כִּי בּוֹלְהוּ: The Rosh explains that the Gemara could have said that one might have thought that the words: And more, imply the same as the previous total, but it preferred to address the last phrase mentioned in the *baraita*.

If he then added the word *hen* he has accepted one, etc. – הֵן – אַחַת וְכוּ': Most commentaries explain that the novelty of Sumakhos's teaching is that one can accept naziriteship in any language. The Rosh indicates that the novelty is that if one says: I am hereby *hen*, or: I am hereby *digon*, he has accepted one or two terms of naziriteship, respectively. This is because the phrase: I am hereby, serves as an intimation of naziriteship. Additionally, the words of Greek origin mentioned here are not numbers but rather refer to shapes with certain numbers of sides, and the novelty is that despite the imprecision of his language, it is understood that one is referring to terms of naziriteship.

HALAKHA

A round house, etc. – בית עגול וכי: Only a house with four walls can become impure with leprosy. If the house is round or has three or five walls, it cannot become impure (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tzara'at* 14:6).

BACKGROUND

Leprosy of the house – נגעי בתים – By Torah law (see Leviticus 14:33–57), if leprosy spots appear on a house, all the objects in the house are removed in order to prevent them from becoming ritually impure, after which a priest is brought to examine the house. If the priest confirms that there is evidence of leprosy, the house is quarantined for a week, after which it is reexamined by the priest. If the leprosy spots have darkened or disappeared, the house is declared ritually pure. If the spots have remained unchanged, the house is quarantined for a second week. If the spots then darken, the house is declared ritually pure after undergoing a purification process. However, if the spots remain unchanged or have spread, the affected parts of the house are removed and replaced with new materials, after which the house is quarantined for a third week. If the spots reappear, the entire house must be destroyed, and its stones are disposed of in a ritually impure place.

A leprosy house renders people and objects inside it ritually impure, with the exception of objects in hermetically sealed earthenware containers. If the house is declared free of leprosy, it is purified by a process involving birds, cedarwood, and red thread, parallel to the purification process of a leprosy person.

NOTES

It states, when referring to a wall, the plural term walls, etc. – הוא אומר קיר, קירות וכי: It is noted in the Commentary on *Nazir* that the *baraita* does not expound every instance where the word wall appears in the verses pertaining to leprosy on a house, as the verse also states: “And its appearance be lower than the wall” (Leviticus 14:37). Rather, the *baraita* expounds only the instances in which the plural walls is used unnecessarily instead of the singular term wall.

The early commentaries ask why the plural terms are considered unnecessary, given that the Gemara derives from these terms that a house is considered to be afflicted with leprosy only if a symptom appears on a corner of the house, such that a single, unbroken spot appears on two walls (*Sanhedrin* 71a). The Rosh answers that only one of the plural terms is necessary for that derivation, and the other usage serves as the source for the *halakha* that only a four-sided house can be afflicted with leprosy. Alternatively, Rabbeinu Peretz states that if the plural term were used only in order to teach that the symptom must appear on a corner of the house, the Torah would have used the same term throughout.

תנו רבנן: בית עגול, דיגון, טריגון, פונטיגון – אינו מטמא בנגעים. טריגון מטמא בנגעים. מאי טעמא? למטה הוא אומר “קיר” “קירות”. למעלה הוא אומר “קיר” “קירות” – הרי כאן ארבע.

הדרן עלך כל בנינו

The Gemara cites another *baraita* dealing with these same expressions: **The Sages taught: A round house,^a a two-sided house, a triangle-shaped house, and a pentagon-shaped house cannot become impure with leprosy,** whereas a house shaped like a quadrilateral can become impure with leprosy.^b **What is the reason for this?** In the verse below it states, when referring to a wall, the plural term walls:ⁿ “And, behold, if the plague has spread in the walls of the house” (Leviticus 14:39). Additionally, in the verse above it states, when referring to a wall, the plural term walls: “And behold, if the plague be in the walls of the house” (Leviticus 14:37). These plural terms are unnecessary, and it is therefore understood that **there are four walls mentioned here** in order to indicate that a house can become impure through leprosy only if it has four sides.