



1:3 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. If one said: I am hereby a nazirite for one long term, or: I am hereby a nazirite for one short term, or even if one said: I am hereby a nazirite from now until the end of the world, in all these cases he is a nazirite for thirty days. If one said: I am hereby a nazirite and one day, or: I am hereby a nazirite and one hour, or: I am hereby a nazirite for one and a half, he becomes a nazirite for two consecutive terms of naziriteship. When he says: I am hereby a nazirite, he accepts upon himself one thirty-day term of naziriteship. When he subsequently adds an additional amount of time, e.g., an extra day, he thereby accepts upon himself an additional term of naziriteship, and the minimal term of naziriteship is thirty days. One who says: I am hereby a nazirite for thirty days and one hour, becomes a nazirite for thirty-one days, as there is no naziriteship for hours but only for full days.

1:4 If one says: I am hereby a nazirite like the hair of my head, 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, 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.

1:5 If one says: I am hereby a nazirite in accordance with the capacity of the house, or: The capacity of the basket, one checks with him 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, it is assumed that he meant to accept upon himself terms of naziriteship 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 seeds, which are extremely small, and he is a nazirite for his entire life.

1:6 If one says: I am hereby a nazirite from here until such and such a place, 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.

1:7 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.

2:1 If one says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs and from cakes of dried figs, Beit Shammai say: His statement renders him a full-fledged nazirite, and his addition: From dried figs, is insignificant, as this fruit is not included in the prohibitions of a nazirite, which include only products of the grapevine. And Beit Hillel say: He is not a nazirite, since he did not accept naziriteship upon himself. Rabbi Yehuda said: Even when Beit Shammai said that this vow takes effect, they said that only in a case where one said that he meant: They are hereby forbidden to me as an offering. In that case it is as though he took a vow rendering the figs forbidden to him. However, Beit Shammai concede that although the vow takes effect, it is not a vow of naziriteship.

2:2 If one said: This cow said: I am hereby a nazirite if I stand up; or if he said: This door says: I am hereby a nazirite if I am opened, Beit Shammai say he is a nazirite, and Beit Hillel say he is not a nazirite. Rabbi Yehuda said: Even when Beit Shammai say that the vow is effective, they say so only with regard to one who said: This cow is hereby forbidden to me as an offering if it stands up. In that case it is as if he took a vow that the cow is forbidden. However, Beit Shammai concede that although the vow takes effect, it is not a vow of naziriteship.

2:3 If they poured one a cup of wine and he said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it, he is a full-fledged nazirite who must observe all the halakhot of naziriteship. An incident occurred with regard to a certain woman who was intoxicated from wine, and they poured a cup for her and she said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it. The Sages said: This woman did not intend to accept naziriteship but rather, meant to say: It is hereby forbidden to me as an offering. She vowed against deriving benefit from that cup alone, since she did not want to drink any more.

2:4 If one says: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that I will be allowed to drink wine and may become ritually impure from corpses, i.e., he wishes to be a nazirite only with respect to the growth of his hair, he is a full-fledged nazirite and is prohibited from engaging in all of the behaviors forbidden to a nazirite, including consuming products of the vine and contracting impurity from a corpse. If one stated a vow of naziriteship and then said: I know that there is naziriteship, but I do not know that a nazirite is prohibited from wine, he is prohibited in all the prohibitions of naziriteship. But Rabbi Shimon permits him, since he holds that naziriteship takes effect only if the person accepts all the relevant prohibitions. If one said: I know that a nazirite is prohibited from wine, but I thought that the Sages would permit me to drink wine because I cannot live without wine, or: I thought that the Sages would allow me to contract impurity from corpses because I bury the dead, he is permitted and the vow of naziriteship does not take effect, but Rabbi Shimon prohibits him.

2:5 If one says: I am hereby a nazirite and it is incumbent upon me to shave a nazirite, meaning he will also pay for the offerings that a nazirite brings when he cuts his hair; and another heard and said: And I too am a nazirite and it is incumbent upon me to shave a nazirite, the other is also a nazirite and

is obligated to pay for the offerings of a nazirite. If they were perspicacious and wish to limit their expenses, they shave each other. They may each pay for the other's offerings, so that their additional vows will not cost them anything. And if not, if this arrangement did not occur to them and each brought his own offerings, they shave other nazirites, i.e., they must pay for the offerings of other nazirites.

2:6 If one says: It is incumbent upon me to shave half a nazirite, i.e., he is vowing to pay half the costs of a nazirite's offerings, and another heard and said: And I, it is incumbent upon me to shave half a nazirite, this one shaves a whole nazirite and that one shaves a whole nazirite, i.e., each pays the full cost of a nazirite's offerings; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir, since there is no such entity as half a nazirite. And the Rabbis say: This one shaves half a nazirite and that one shaves half a nazirite; they may join together to pay for the offerings of one nazirite.

2:7 If one said: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a son, and a son was born to him, he is a nazirite. If a daughter, a tumtum, or a hermaphrodite [androgynos] is born to him, he is not a nazirite, since a son was not born to him. However, if he says: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a child, then even if a daughter, a tumtum, or a hermaphrodite is born to him, he is a nazirite.

2:8 However, if his wife miscarried he is not a nazirite, since his wife did not give birth to a live child. Rabbi Shimon says: Since it is possible that the fetus was viable, in which case his vow of naziriteship takes effect, he should say the following: If this fetus was viable in terms of its development but died due to other causes, I am hereby an obligatory nazirite in fulfillment of my vow; and if it was not viable, I am hereby a voluntary nazirite. He then proceeds to observe naziriteship. If, subsequent to this, his wife gave birth again, he is a nazirite, since the unattributed opinion in the mishna holds that the condition of his vow has now been fulfilled. Rabbi Shimon says, following his earlier ruling: He must now accept upon himself an additional naziriteship and he should say: If the first fetus was viable then my naziriteship for the first child was obligatory, and this naziriteship is voluntary; and if the first child was not viable, then the naziriteship for the first one was voluntary and this naziriteship is obligatory.

2:9 In a case where one said: I am hereby a nazirite now, and I will be a nazirite when I will have a son, and he began counting his own term of naziriteship, i.e., his first vow, and afterward in the middle of this naziriteship period a son was born to him, he first completes his own initial term of naziriteship and afterward he counts the term of naziriteship he vowed on the condition of the birth of his son. However, if he reversed the order and said: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a son, and I am hereby a nazirite, and he began counting his own term of naziriteship and afterward, during this period, a son was born to him, he sets aside his own term of naziriteship and counts that which he vowed on condition of the birth of his son, and afterward he completes his own term of naziriteship.

2:10 In the case of one who said: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a son, and he added: I am hereby a nazirite from now for one hundred days, and he

then began observing the one hundred days of his naziriteship, if a son is born to him up to seventy days from the start of his naziriteship he has not lost anything. He pauses from the observance of the naziriteship of one hundred days and observes the thirty-day term for his son. He then completes the thirty or more days left of his initial naziriteship. However, if his son is born after seventy days, this negates the first seventy days, and he must observe a full hundred days after he completes the naziriteship for his son. The reason is that here, he is unable to merely complete the remaining days of his initial naziriteship after shaving at the completion of the naziriteship for his son, since shaving cannot be performed after a period of less than thirty days.

3:1 One who said: I am hereby a nazirite, without specifying how long his term of naziriteship would last, shaves his hair on the thirty-first day after the start of his naziriteship, as an unspecified term of naziriteship lasts thirty days. And if he shaved on the thirtieth day, he has fulfilled his obligation. If he explicitly said: I am hereby a nazirite for thirty days, then, if he shaved on the thirtieth day, he has not fulfilled his obligation. Since the naziriteship would have been for thirty days even without him stating: For thirty days, this addition is understood to indicate that he will observe naziriteship for a full thirty days.

3:2 One who accepted two terms of naziriteship shaves at the close of the first naziriteship on the thirty-first day, and at the close of the second term on the sixty-first day. Since his second term of naziriteship begins after shaving on the thirty-first day, the sixty-first day of the first term is the thirty-first day of his second term. And if he shaved for the first term on the thirtieth day, he shaves for the second term on the sixtieth day, which is the thirty-first day after the start of his second term of naziriteship. And if he shaved for the second term on day sixty less one, he has fulfilled his obligation, as this is the thirtieth day of his second term. And this testimony was attested to by Rabbi Pappeyas, who heard from his teachers with regard to one who vowed to observe two terms of naziriteship, that if he shaved for the first term on the thirtieth day, he shaves for the second term on the sixtieth day. And if he shaved for the second term on the day sixty less one, he has fulfilled his obligation, because the thirtieth day of the first term of naziriteship counts as part of his tally of the second term.

3:3 One who said: I am hereby a nazirite, without further specification, if he became ritually impure through contact with a corpse on the thirtieth day of his term of naziriteship, it negates the entire tally, and he must start his naziriteship afresh. Rabbi Eliezer says: It negates only seven days, which he must observe until his purification, after which he brings his offerings. If he said: I am hereby a nazirite for thirty days, and he became impure on the thirtieth day, everyone agrees that it negates the entire tally.

3:4 If he said: I am hereby a nazirite for one hundred days, if he became impure on the one hundredth day, it negates the entire tally. Rabbi Eliezer says: It negates only thirty days, and he observes the final thirty days again. If he became impure on the one hundred and first day before bringing his offerings, it negates only thirty days, but does not negate all of the observed days. Rabbi Eliezer says: It negates only seven days.

3:5 One who took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery, even if he was there for a full thirty days without leaving, those days he spent in the cemetery do not count as part of his tally, since his naziriteship has not yet gone into effect. And he therefore does not bring the three offerings of impurity, brought by a nazirite when rendered ritually impure by contact with a corpse, despite having been in a cemetery. If he left the cemetery and entered it again, those days do count as part of his tally, meaning the naziriteship takes effect, and he does bring the offerings of impurity for reentering the cemetery. Rabbi Eliezer says: This halakha does not apply to one who entered the cemetery on the very day that he left it, as it is stated with regard to the halakhot of a ritually impure nazirite: “But the first days shall be void” (Numbers 6:12), which indicates that he does not bring the offerings until he will have “first days” of purity, during which he observed his naziriteship.

3:6 One who vowed many days of naziriteship while outside Eretz Yisrael, and completed his naziriteship, and afterward came to Eretz Yisrael, in order to bring the offerings at the end of his naziriteship, Beit Shammai say: He must be a nazirite for thirty days, so that he has observed a term of naziriteship in ritual purity in Eretz Yisrael, and Beit Hillel say: He is a nazirite from the beginning, that is, he must observe his entire naziriteship again. The mishna cites a related story: An incident occurred with regard to Queen Helene, whose son had gone to war, and she said: If my son will return from war safely, I will be a nazirite for seven years. And her son returned safely from the war, and she was a nazirite for seven years. And at the end of seven years, she ascended to Eretz Yisrael, and Beit Hillel instructed her, in accordance with their opinion, that she should be a nazirite for an additional seven years. And at the end of those seven years she became ritually impure, and was therefore required to observe yet another seven years of naziriteship, as ritual impurity negates the tally of a nazirite. And she was found to be a nazirite for twenty-one years. Rabbi Yehuda said: She was a nazirite for only fourteen years and not twenty-one.

3:7 In a case of one who had two sets of witnesses testifying about him that he had taken a vow of naziriteship for a certain period, and these witnesses testify that he took a vow of naziriteship for two terms, and these witnesses testify that he took a vow of naziriteship for five terms. Beit Shammai say: The testimony is divided, i.e., the testimonies contradict each other, and since the testimonies are in conflict they are both rejected entirely and there is no naziriteship here at all. And Beit Hillel say: The testimonies are not completely in conflict with each other, as two terms are included in five terms, and the unanimous testimony, that he is a nazirite for two terms, is accepted.

4:1 With regard to one who said: I am hereby a nazirite, and another heard this vow and said: And I, and a third person added: And I, they are all nazirites. If the vow of the first was dissolved by a halakhic authority, they are all dissolved. However, if the vow of the last individual was dissolved by a halakhic authority, the vow of the last individual alone is dissolved, and all the others remain bound by their nazirite vows. If someone said: I am hereby a

nazirite, and another heard and said: My mouth is like his mouth and my hair is like his hair, he is a nazirite. If one said: I am hereby a nazirite, and his wife heard him and said: And I, he can nullify her vow of naziriteship if he so chooses (see Numbers 30:7–16). But his vow remains intact, as his naziriteship is not dependent on hers. However, if the wife said: I am hereby a nazirite, and her husband heard and said: And I, he cannot nullify her vow of naziriteship, as he would thereby be nullifying his own vow, which he made dependent on hers, and he does not have the ability to nullify his own vow.

4:2 If he said to his wife: I am hereby a nazirite, and you, i.e., you shall be a nazirite as well, and she said: Amen, in acceptance of this vow, he can nullify her vow, and his vow remains intact. However, if the wife said: I am hereby a nazirite, and you, and he said: Amen, he cannot nullify her vow.

4:3 With regard to a woman who vowed to be a nazirite, and she transgressed her vow since she was drinking wine and rendering herself ritually impure by contact with the dead, she incurs the forty lashes for each of the Torah prohibitions she transgressed. If her husband nullified her vow, and she did not know that her husband had nullified her vow, and she was drinking wine and rendering herself impure by contact with the dead, she does not incur the forty lashes, as she is no longer a nazirite. Rabbi Yehuda says: Even if she does not incur the forty lashes by Torah law, she should incur lashes for rebelliousness [makat mardut], an extrajudicial punishment imposed by the Sages, for her intention to commit a transgression, since she believed that it was prohibited to her.

4:4 With regard to a woman who vowed to be a nazirite and separated her animals for her offerings of purity at the end of her term, and afterward her husband nullified her vow, which means that she is not in fact a nazirite, what becomes of these animals? If the animal was his, it shall go out and graze among the flock until it becomes blemished, like regular non-consecrated animals. And if the animal was hers, different halakhot apply to the various offerings: The animal she set aside as a sin-offering must be left to die by being shut in an enclosed area and deprived of food and water, as will be explained in the Gemara. And the animal separated for a burnt-offering is sacrificed on the altar as a burnt-offering, as in any case one may bring a voluntary burnt-offering. As for the one designated for a peace-offering, it is sacrificed as a voluntary peace-offering. And this peace-offering is eaten for only one day, in accordance with the halakha of the nazirite's peace-offering, despite the fact that regular peace-offerings may be eaten for two days. But the offering does not require bread, i.e., loaves and wafers, unlike that of a nazirite. If she had unallocated funds, i.e., she had separated money for her offerings but had not stated which coins were designated for which offering, all the money will be earmarked for communal gift offerings. If she had allocated funds, i.e., she had decided which coins were for the payment of each offering, even if she had not yet purchased the animals, the money for the sin-offering is taken and cast into the Dead Sea, i.e., it must be destroyed, either by being thrown into the sea or by some other means. One may not benefit from it, as it possesses a measure of sanctity, but one also does not misuse property consecrated to the Temple with

it. In other words, if one did derive benefit from this money he is not liable to bring an offering for misusing consecrated property. As for the money for the burnt-offering, a burnt-offering is brought with those coins, and one who benefits from it is liable for misuse of consecrated property, as it is sacred since it can be used toward the purchase of a gift offering. Similarly, with regard to the money for a peace-offering, a peace-offering is brought with those coins, and it is eaten for one day and does not require bread.

4:5 The previous mishna discussed the case of a husband who nullified his wife's vow after she separated her offerings of naziriteship. This mishna deals with a husband who nullified his wife's naziriteship after she had completed her term and brought her offerings to the Temple. If the blood from one of her naziriteship offerings was sprinkled on the altar on her behalf, the husband cannot nullify her vow at this point. Rabbi Akiva says: Even before the sprinkling of the blood, he cannot nullify the vow as soon as any one of the animals for her offerings has been slaughtered on her behalf. The mishna continues: In what case is this statement, that he can no longer nullify the vow, said? It is when she is bringing the offerings for her shaving of ritual purity, when she has completed her term of naziriteship without becoming ritually impure (see Numbers 6:18). However, if she is sacrificing the offerings for her shaving of impurity, when she became ritually impure during her term of naziriteship, after which she restarts her naziriteship (see Numbers 6:9), her husband can nullify her vow. The reason is that he can say: I do not want a downcast [menuvvelet] wife, who does not drink wine. She would have to refrain from wine for a lengthy period if she were to begin her naziriteship anew. Rabbi Meir says: He can nullify her vow even at the stage of her shaving of purity, after she has begun sacrificing her offerings, as he can say: I do not want a shaven wife, and a nazirite is obligated to shave after bringing his or her offerings.

4:6 A man can vow that his minor son should be a nazirite, i.e., a father can declare his son a nazirite, but a woman cannot vow that her son should be a nazirite. How so; what are the details of this naziriteship? If the son shaved his hair, thereby demonstrating his rejection of the vow imposed by his father; or if his relatives shaved him; or if the son objected by saying that he has no desire for this naziriteship; or if his relatives objected on his behalf, the naziriteship is canceled. If this son who canceled the naziriteship had animals separated for his offerings, the one set aside for the sin-offering must die, and the burnt-offering is sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and the peace-offering is sacrificed as a peace-offering. And the peace-offering is eaten for one day, like the peace-offering of a nazirite, rather than the two days of a regular peace-offering, and it does not require bread, i.e., the loaves that accompany a nazirite's peace-offering. If he had unallocated funds, they will be allocated for communal gift offerings. If he had allocated funds for his offerings, the money for the sin-offering is taken and cast into the Dead Sea, as one may not benefit from it ab initio, but if he benefits from it, he is not liable to bring an offering for misuse of consecrated property. With the money for the burnt-offering they bring a burnt-offering; it is prohibited to derive benefit from those coins and if he benefits from it, he is

liable to bring an offering for misuse of consecrated property. With the money for the peace-offering they bring a peace-offering, and it is eaten for one day and does not require bread.

4:7 A man can shave, i.e., bring the offerings at the close of his term of naziriteship, by using offerings originally designated for his father's naziriteship, but a woman cannot shave by means of the offerings for her father's naziriteship. How so; how is this halakha applied? It applies to one whose father was a nazirite and separated unallocated money for his naziriteship, i.e., he did not state which coins were for which of his offerings, and he died before buying the animals, and the son said after his father's death: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that I will shave by means of the money that my father set aside. Rabbi Yosei said: In that case these coins are allocated for communal gift offerings, and the son may not use them, as this is not the case of the halakha that a son can shave by using his father's naziriteship. Rather, who is the son who can shave by using his father's naziriteship? This is referring to a son and his father who were both nazirites during his father's lifetime, and his father separated unallocated money for his naziriteship and died; this is the one who may shave by using his father's naziriteship.

5:1 Beit Shammai say: Consecration that one performs in error nevertheless renders property consecrated, and Beit Hillel say it is not consecrated. How so; what is considered an act of erroneous consecration? If one said: A black bull that will emerge from my house first is consecrated, and a white bull emerged first, Beit Shammai say it is consecrated and Beit Hillel say it is not consecrated.

5:2 Similarly, if one said: A gold dinar that will come up first in my hand is consecrated, and when he reached into his pocket a dinar of silver came up, Beit Shammai say it is consecrated and Beit Hillel say it is not consecrated. Likewise, if one said: A barrel of wine that will come up first in my hand when I enter the cellar is consecrated, and a barrel of oil came up in his hand instead, Beit Shammai say it is consecrated and Beit Hillel say it is not consecrated.

5:3 With regard to one who took a vow of naziriteship, who then regretted his vow and stopped observing the prohibition against drinking wine, and later requested of a halakhic authority to dissolve his vow, and the authority ruled that he is bound by his vow, finding no reason to dissolve it, he counts the term of naziriteship from the time that he vowed, including the days when he acted as though the vow were dissolved. In a case where he requested of a halakhic authority to dissolve his vow and the authority dissolved it, if he had an animal separated as a nazirite offering it shall go out and graze among the flock. On the basis of this halakha, and continuing their discussion in the previous mishna, Beit Hillel said to Beit Shammai: Don't you concede with regard to this case that it is an erroneous act of consecration, and yet the halakha is that it shall go out and graze among the flock? This shows that you too accept the principle that an erroneous act of consecration does not take effect. Beit Shammai said to Beit Hillel: Don't you concede with regard to one who was separating the animal tithe from his herd, i.e., passing his

animals before him single file and consecrating every tenth one as a tithe, that if he erred and called the ninth animal: Tenth; and the tenth: Ninth; and the eleventh: Tenth, that each of them is consecrated? This proves that an erroneous act of consecration does take effect. Beit Hillel said to them: It is not the rod that consecrates it. The touch of the rod does not consecrate the animal, nor does the fact that he said: Tenth, by mistake. Not all errors cause the tithe to be consecrated, and the proof is as follows: And what would be the halakha if he had erred and placed the rod on the eighth or on the twelfth, and labeled them: Tenth? Can it be suggested that perhaps he performed anything of consequence? The halakha is that the eighth or twelfth animal cannot be consecrated as tithe. Rather, why is the ninth or eleventh animal consecrated? There is a specific reason for this halakha, as the same verse that consecrated the tenth also consecrated the ninth and the eleventh. It is a Torah edict that the consecration takes effect with regard to those two animals. Therefore, one cannot infer from this case that an erroneous act of consecration takes effect.

5:4 With regard to one who took a vow of naziriteship and went to bring his animal which he set aside for his nazirite offering and discovered that it was stolen, and due to the need to separate an additional animal now regrets having taken his vow, if he took a vow of naziriteship before his animal was stolen, he is a nazirite, as a vow cannot be dissolved as the result of a later event. But if he took a vow of naziriteship after his animal was stolen, he is not a nazirite, as it is retroactively established that his vow was taken in error from the outset, as he relied on an animal he did not possess. And this was the error that Nahum the Mede erred when he failed to distinguish between an event that occurred before the vow was taken and an event that occurred afterward. The incident in question was as follows: When nazirites were ascending from the exile to sacrifice their offerings, and they found the Temple destroyed, Nahum the Mede said to them: If you had known that the Temple would be destroyed, would you have taken a vow of naziriteship? They said to him: Certainly not, as there is no remedy for a naziriteship in this case. And Nahum the Mede dissolved the vow for them. And when the matter came before the Rabbis, they said: His ruling is incorrect. Rather, whoever took a vow of naziriteship before the Temple was destroyed, like these nazirites from the exile, he is a nazirite, as he committed no error at the time of his vow, and one cannot dissolve vows based a new situation. However, one who stated his vow after the Temple was destroyed is not a nazirite, as he vowed based on an erroneous assumption.

5:5 If there were people walking along the way, and one other person was approaching them, and one of those walking said: I am hereby a nazirite if this person approaching us is so-and-so. And another one of them said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is not so-and-so, while a third member of the group said: I am hereby a nazirite if one of you two is a nazirite, and a fourth said: I am hereby a nazirite if neither of you is a nazirite, and another added: I am hereby a nazirite if both of you are nazirites. Finally, the last person said: I am hereby a nazirite if all you who spoke before me are nazirites. Beit Shammai say that they are all nazirites, as by saying: I am hereby a nazirite, they have accepted naziriteship upon themselves even if their statements turn

out to be incorrect. Beit Shammai maintain that a vow of naziriteship taken in error is considered a valid vow of naziriteship. And Beit Hillel say: Only he whose statement was not fulfilled is a nazirite. And Rabbi Tarfon says: Not a single one of them is a nazirite, including those whose statements were correct. Rabbi Tarfon maintains that a vow of naziriteship must be pronounced in an explicit manner, without any hint of uncertainty. In this case, none of them knew for sure the identity of the person coming toward them, and therefore they could not be certain they were nazirites at the time of their vows.

5:6 If the person approaching them turned back so that his identity was never discovered, not one of them is a nazirite. The matter was never clarified, and the halakha is lenient in cases of uncertain naziriteship. Rabbi Shimon says that the halakha is stringent with regard to an uncertainty of this kind, and therefore they should proceed as follows in order to avoid any uncertainty: Each of those who took a vow should say: If it was in accordance with my statement, I am hereby an obligatory nazirite, as my condition was fulfilled, and if not, I am hereby a voluntary nazirite, and in this manner they are all nazirites either way.

5:7 Someone saw a kosher animal with characteristics of both a domesticated animal and a non-domesticated animal [koy], and said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a non-domesticated animal; and another individual said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is not a non-domesticated animal; and a third person said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a domesticated animal; and a fourth said: I am hereby a nazirite if this not a domesticated animal. The mishna continues: A fifth person added: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a non-domesticated animal and a domesticated animal, and a sixth person said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is neither a non-domesticated animal nor a domesticated animal. Someone who heard all the above statements said: I am hereby a nazirite if one of you is a nazirite, and another one stated: I am hereby a nazirite if not one of you is a nazirite, and a final person said: I am hereby a nazirite if all of you are nazirites. In this case, they are all nazirites.

6:1 Three types of actions are prohibited for a nazirite: The contraction of ritual impurity from a corpse, and the shaving of one's hair, and eating or drinking any substances that emerge from the vine. The mishna adds: And all products that emerge from the vine combine with one another to the amount that renders a nazirite liable to receive lashes. And he is liable only if he eats an olive-bulk of the grapes. An initial version of the mishna says that a nazirite is liable to receive lashes only if he drinks a quarter-log of wine. Rabbi Akiva says: Even if he soaked his bread in wine and the two together contain enough to combine to the amount of an olive-bulk, he is liable.

6:2 And furthermore, a nazirite is liable to receive lashes for consuming wine by itself, and for grapes by themselves, and for hartzannim by themselves, and for zaggim by themselves, as each of these is forbidden separately by the Torah. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: He is liable only if he eats an olive-bulk that includes at least two hartzannim and one zag, in accordance with the verse "From hartzannim to zag" (Numbers 6:4), where the first term is in the plural and the second in the singular. The mishna discusses the meaning of these terms: Which parts are hartzannim and which are zaggim? The

hartzannim are the outside parts, the skin of the grape, while the zaggim are the inner parts, the seeds. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: The opposite is the case and this is the mnemonic so that you should not err: It is like a bell [zog] worn by an animal, in which the outer part, which corresponds to the skin of a grape, is called zog, and the inner portion of the bell, the clapper, which corresponds to the seeds in a grape, is called inbal.

6:3 A naziriteship of unspecified length lasts for thirty days. If a nazirite shaved his hair during that period, or if he was shaved by bandits [listim] against his will, this negates thirty days of his naziriteship, which he must count afresh. With regard to a nazirite who shaved his hair, whether he did so with scissors or with a razor, or if he pulled out [sifsef ] any amount, he is liable. A nazirite may shampoo [hofef ] his head and separate [mefaspes] his hairs manually, without concern that hairs might fall out. However, he may not comb his hair. Rabbi Yishmael says: A nazirite may not shampoo his hair with earth because this causes the hair to fall out.

6:4 A nazirite who was drinking wine all day is liable to receive only one set of lashes. If people said to him during the course of the day: Do not drink, do not drink, and nevertheless he continues to drink, he is liable for each and every time he was warned. If a nazirite kept shaving all day, he is liable to receive only one set of lashes. If they said to him: Do not shave, do not shave, and he shaves, he is liable for each and every time he was warned. If he became ritually impure from a corpse many times all day, he is liable to receive only one set of lashes. If they said to him: Do not become impure, do not become impure, and he continues to become impure, he is liable for each and every time he was warned.

6:5 Three types of actions are prohibited for a nazirite: Contracting ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, and shaving his hair, and eating or drinking any substances that emerge from the vine. There is a greater stricture with regard to the prohibitions of impurity and shaving than that of substances that emerge from the vine, as impurity and shaving negate his naziriteship, i.e., he must add thirty days to his term of naziriteship or start it afresh. But if he eats or drinks that which emerges from the vine, this does not negate his naziriteship. Conversely, there is a greater stricture with regard to substances that emerge from the vine than with regard to impurity and shaving, as in the case of products that emerge from the vine nothing is exempted from its general prohibition in certain circumstances, i.e., there are no exceptions. But with regard to impurity and shaving certain cases are exempted from their general prohibition. For example, there are the cases of obligatory shaving, e.g., a leper who was purified during his naziriteship, and of a corpse with no one to bury it [met mitzva]. A nazirite may tend to the burial of a met mitzva, despite the fact that he will thereby contract ritual impurity from a corpse. The mishna adds: And there is a greater stricture with regard to impurity than with regard to shaving, as a nazirite's impurity negates all his days of naziriteship and begins his term afresh, and he is liable to bring an offering for it, before starting his new term of naziriteship. But shaving negates only thirty days at most, and he is not liable to bring an offering for it.

6:6 With regard to the shaving of ritual impurity performed by a nazirite who became impure during his naziriteship, how is it performed? The priest would sprinkle the waters of purification on him on the third and the seventh days after he contracted his impurity, as performed for all those who contracted impurity imparted by a corpse. And he shaves his hair on the seventh day and brings his offerings on the eighth day. And if he shaved on the eighth day he brings his offerings on that day, this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Tarfon said to him: What is the difference between this ritual and that of a leper? A leper also shaves on the seventh day and sacrifices his offerings on the eighth. However, if a leper shaves on the eighth day he brings his offerings on the ninth day, not on the day of his shaving. Rabbi Akiva said to him: The purification of this impure nazirite depends on his days, as he immerses on the seventh day like all those who contract impurity imparted by a corpse, which means he is already ritually pure on the eighth day. But with regard to a leper, his purification depends on his shaving. Any immersion performed earlier is of no account, and must be repeated. And a leper brings his offering only if the sun has set following his immersion. Since offerings are not sacrificed at night, the bringing of his offering is postponed until the following day.

6:7 With regard to a nazirite's shaving of purity after the completion of his term of naziriteship, how is it performed? He would bring three animals: One for a sin-offering, one for a burnt-offering, and one for a peace-offering. And he slaughters the peace-offering and shaves his hair after he slaughters them. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Elazar says: He would shave only after he slaughtered the sin-offering, as the sin-offering precedes the other offerings in all places, and therefore he sacrifices the sin-offering first. He shaves his hair after he slaughters this offering. And if he shaved after the sacrifice of any one of the three of them, he has fulfilled his obligation after the fact.

6:8 Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If a nazirite brought three animals without specifying which of them was for which offering, the one that is fit for a sin-offering, i.e., a female sheep in its first year, is sacrificed as a sin-offering; that which is fit for a burnt-offering, a male sheep in its first year, is sacrificed as a burnt-offering; and that which is fit for a peace-offering, a ram, i.e., a male sheep over the age of one year, is sacrificed as a peace-offering. After the nazirite shaved off his hair, he would take the hair of his consecrated head and throw it under the pot in which the peace-offering was cooked, where it would burn. And if the nazirite shaved in the rest of the country, i.e., outside the Temple, he would not throw the hair under the pot. In what case is this statement said? It is said with regard to the shaving of purity. However, with regard to the shaving of impurity, i.e., shaving that accompanied his guilt-offering and sin-offering of birds after his term of naziriteship was interrupted by impurity, he would not throw his hair under the pot in which his offerings were cooked, as the Torah stated this requirement only for a pure nazirite. Rabbi Meir says: Everyone throws his hair under the pot, including a pure nazirite who shaved outside the Temple and an impure nazirite, except for an impure nazirite who shaved in the rest of the

country. In that case alone he refrains from throwing his hair to be burned beneath his offering.

6:9 The nazirite would cook the peace-offering or overcook it, i.e., cook it thoroughly. The priest takes the cooked foreleg from the ram, and one unleavened loaf from the basket, and one unleavened wafer, and places them on the palms of the nazirite and waves them, as described in the Torah (Numbers 6:19–20). And afterward the nazirite is permitted to drink wine and to contract ritual impurity imparted by a corpse. Rabbi Shimon says: Once the blood of one of the offerings has been sprinkled on the nazirite's behalf, the nazirite is permitted to drink wine and to contract ritual impurity imparted by a corpse. The rest of the ritual is not indispensable for his purification.

6:10 As taught earlier (45a) the nazirite shaves after having brought one, or all, of his offerings. This mishna discusses what the halakha is if the offering was found to be invalid after the nazirite had shaved. If a nazirite shaved based upon the requisite offering, and afterward the offering was found to be invalid for any reason, his shaving is invalid and his offerings do not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation. If he shaved based upon the sin-offering, that was found to have been sacrificed not for its own sake, which invalidates the offering, and afterward he brought his other offerings for their own sake, his shaving is invalid and his other offerings do not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation. If he shaved based upon the requisite burnt-offering or having brought the requisite peace-offering, and these were offered not for their own sake, and afterward he brought his remaining offerings for their own sake, his shaving is invalid and his offerings do not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation. Rabbi Shimon says: In the case of one who shaved based upon a burnt-offering or a peace-offering that was sacrificed not for its own sake, that offering, which was performed incorrectly, does not count toward the fulfillment of his obligation; however, his other offerings do count. And everyone agrees that if he shaved based upon all three of them, i.e., he brought all three offerings, without specifying which offering he is basing his shaving upon, and even one of them was found valid, his shaving is valid, but he must bring the other offerings in order to fulfill his obligation.

6:11 With regard to one on whose behalf the blood of one of his nazirite offerings was sprinkled on the altar, and he became ritually impure before bringing the rest of his offerings, Rabbi Eliezer says: His impurity negates the entire tally, and he remains a nazirite. And the Rabbis say: Let him bring the rest of his offerings and be purified. The Rabbis said to Rabbi Eliezer: An incident occurred involving Miriam of Tarmod who was a nazirite, that the blood of one of her offerings was sprinkled on her behalf, and they came and told her that her daughter was mortally ill. And she went and found that her daughter was dead, and thereby contracted impurity. And the Rabbis said: Let her bring the rest of her offerings and be purified.

7:1 A High Priest and a nazirite may not become ritually impure even to bury their deceased relatives. However, they become impure to bury a corpse with no one to bury it [met mitzva]. If one of them comes across the corpse of a Jew,

and there is nobody else available to bury it, he must bury the body. If a High Priest and a nazirite were walking along the way and they found a met mitzva, and one of them can tend to the burial by himself, Rabbi Eliezer says: Let the High Priest become impure, and do not let the nazirite become impure. And the Rabbis say: Let the nazirite become impure, and do not let even a common priest become impure. Rabbi Eliezer said to the Rabbis: It is preferable to let the priest become impure, as he does not bring an offering for his impurity, and do not let the nazirite become impure, as he brings an offering for his impurity. The Rabbis said to him: On the contrary, let the nazirite become impure, as his sanctity is not permanent, and do not let a priest become impure, as his sanctity is permanent.

7:2 A nazirite shaves for having become impure from these following sources of ritual impurity: For having become impure with impurity imparted by a corpse; and for impurity imparted by an olive-bulk of a corpse; and for impurity imparted by an olive-bulk of fluid [netzel] from a corpse; and for impurity imparted by a full ladle [tarvad] of dust from a corpse; and for impurity imparted by the spine; and for impurity imparted by the skull; and for impurity imparted by a limb from a corpse or for impurity imparted by a limb severed from a living person, upon either of which there is a fitting quantity of flesh; and for impurity imparted by a half-kav of bones from a corpse; and for impurity imparted by a half-log of blood. And a nazirite shaves in each of these cases for becoming impure by coming into contact with them; and for becoming impure by carrying them; and for becoming impure by their tent, i.e., if he was positioned like a tent over them, or if he entered a tent that contains them, or if they served as a tent over him. And as for a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk, he shaves for becoming impure by coming into contact with it and by carrying it. However, he is not rendered impure with the impurity imparted in a tent, i.e., by being under the same roof as the bone. For all of these occurrences, a nazirite shaves, and a priest sprinkles the ashes of the red heifer on him on the third and on the seventh days to purify him from the impurity imparted by a corpse. And he negates all the previous days he counted toward his naziriteship, and he begins counting his term of naziriteship again only after he becomes pure and brings his offerings.

7:3 The previous mishna listed the sources of ritual impurity for which a nazirite must shave. This mishna adds: However, the nazirite does not shave for these: The hanging branches over a corpse, i.e., a tree overhanging a body that a nazirite passes, but it is uncertain which branches are over a corpse; and the projecting stones from fences when the place of the impurity is unknown; and a beit haperas, a place that contained a grave and was plowed. In the latter case, the entire area around the grave is impure from a corpse due to an uncertainty, as it might contain human bones. The mishna continues its list: And the land of the nations, i.e., a nazirite left Eretz Yisrael for another land. The Sages decreed that all land outside of Eretz Yisrael is ritually impure. And the grave cover; and the grave walls upon which the cover rests; and a quarter-log of blood from a corpse; and a tent; and a quarter-kav of bones of a corpse; and vessels that are touching a corpse. And if the nazirite is in the days of his counting, i.e., the seven days a leper must count after

purification from his leprosy; or in his days of full leprosy, when he is a full-fledged leper, for these the nazirite does not shave. This is the case even if he is rendered impure by one of the sources listed in the previous mishna. And in those cases listed that involve ritual impurity from a corpse, one sprinkles the purification water upon him on the third and on the seventh days of his purification, and he does not negate the earlier days of his naziriteship, but they are considered part of his naziriteship term. And he starts counting the rest of his naziriteship to complete his term immediately after his purification, and he has no obligation to sacrifice an offering of impurity for these sources of ritual impurity. Actually they said an ancient tradition that these days of the impurity of the zav (Leviticus 15:1–15) and the zava (Leviticus 15:25–30) and the days of the confinement of a leper before he is confirmed as a full-fledged leper (Leviticus 13:4–5) count for him toward the period of his naziriteship.

7:4 Rabbi Eliezer said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: With regard to any ritual impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite must shave, one is liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting that impurity. If someone who became impure from one of those sources of impurity enters the Temple, he violates the prohibition against an impure individual entering the sacred space. And with regard to any impurity from a corpse for which a nazirite does not shave, one is likewise not liable due to the prohibition of entering the Temple after contracting it. Rabbi Meir said: This impurity from a corpse that does not obligate a nazirite to shave should not be more lenient than the impurity of a creeping animal. The Torah clearly states that one rendered impure from a creeping animal is prohibited from entering the Temple (see Leviticus 5:2–3). The mishna continues to address the sources of ritual impurity for which a nazirite must shave. Rabbi Akiva said: I discussed this matter before Rabbi Eliezer and suggested the following a fortiori inference: If, with regard to a bone that is a barley-grain-bulk, which does not render a person impure in a tent, a nazirite must nevertheless shave for touching it or carrying it, then in the case of a quarter-log of blood, which is more stringent in that it renders a person impure in a tent, is it not logical that a nazirite should shave for touching it or carrying it? Rabbi Eliezer said to me: What is this, Akiva? One cannot argue by means of an a fortiori inference here, in this particular case. However, Rabbi Eliezer did not provide a reason for this response. Rabbi Akiva continued: And when I came and presented these matters before Rabbi Yehoshua, he said to me: You spoke well, i.e., your logic is flawless, but they indeed said that this is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, which cannot be refuted by means of an a fortiori inference.

8:1 With regard to two nazirites, where one other person said to them: I saw one of you become impure, but I do not know which one of you it was, they must each complete their naziriteship terms, shave their hair, and both together bring an offering of ritual impurity and an offering of purity, due to the uncertainty. And one of them says to the other: If I am the impure one, the offering of impurity is mine and the offering of purity is yours; and if I am the pure one, the offering of purity is mine and the offering of impurity is yours. And because of the uncertainty they each count a further thirty days of

naziriteship and both together bring an offering of purity. And one of them says: If I am the previously impure one, that offering of impurity sacrificed earlier was mine, and the offering of purity was yours; and this offering sacrificed now is my offering of purity. And if I am the previously pure one, the offering of purity brought earlier was mine, and the offering of impurity was yours; and this current offering is your offering of purity. The previous mishna described how two nazirites sacrifice offerings of impurity and purity, in a situation in which one of them has become impure but they do not know which one. This mishna discusses what must be done if one of them dies before bringing his offerings. Rabbi Yehoshua said: The surviving nazirite asks someone in the marketplace, a non-nazirite, to vow to be a nazirite corresponding to him, i.e., under the same conditions as his own naziriteship, so that he can bring offerings together with him. And he says to him as follows: If I was impure, you are hereby a nazirite immediately; and if I was pure, you are hereby a nazirite after thirty days. And they both proceed to count thirty days and bring an offering of impurity and an offering of purity. And the nazirite who was defined as having uncertain impurity says: If I am the impure one, the offering of impurity is mine and the offering of purity is yours; and if I am the pure one, the offering of purity is mine and the offering of impurity we brought shall be of uncertain status. And they subsequently count another thirty days and bring an offering of purity, and the first nazirite says: If I was the impure one, the offering of impurity that we sacrificed at the end of the first thirty days was mine, and the offering of purity we brought then was yours; and this offering I am bringing now is my offering of purity. And if I was the pure one, and the deceased nazirite was impure, the offering of purity we brought thirty days ago was mine, and the offering of impurity we brought earlier was of uncertain status, and this is your offering of purity. Ben Zoma said to Rabbi Yehoshua: And who will listen to him to vow to be a nazirite corresponding to him? How can one design a halakha on the assumption that a non-nazirite will agree to be a nazirite for a lengthy term? Rather, a different procedure is available: After thirty days of naziriteship he brings a bird sin-offering and an animal burnt-offering, and says: If I was impure, the sin-offering is for my obligation as an impure nazirite, and the burnt-offering is a regular gift offering. And if I was pure, the burnt-offering is for my obligation as a pure nazirite, and the sin-offering is of uncertain status. And he counts another thirty days, and brings an offering of purity, and says: If I was impure, the first burnt-offering I brought should be considered a gift offering, and this one I am bringing now is for my obligation. And if I was pure, the first burnt-offering I brought is for my obligation as a pure nazirite, and this one I am bringing now is a gift offering. And these, i.e., the sin-offering and peace-offering I am sacrificing now, comprises the rest of my offerings that I was obligated to bring earlier. Rabbi Yehoshua said: According to your opinion, it turns out that this nazirite brings his offerings in halves, i.e., in stages. If he was pure, he brings his burnt-offering thirty days before the rest of his offerings. However, the Rabbis agreed with ben Zoma, and disregarded the concern about splitting up the offerings.

8:2 In the case of a nazirite who, on the first day of his naziriteship, was impure from a corpse as a matter of uncertainty and was also a confirmed leper as a matter of uncertainty, i.e., it was uncertain whether or not he had leprosy, how can he fulfill the shaving obligations of a pure nazirite and an impure leper? The problem facing this nazirite is that a leper must shave both when he begins his purification process and at the close of it, one week later. However, a nazirite is prohibited from shaving. Additionally, a leper may not partake of sacrificial food, but a nazirite may. Therefore, he may partake of sacrificial food sixty days after he may have become impure, when the uncertainty with regard to leprosy will have been clarified. He shaves for the first time for his leprosy after thirty days, and for the second time thirty days later, the shaving of the end of the purification process; at which point he brings the offerings of a purified leper and may partake of sacrificial food. But he may drink wine and become impure from the dead, effectively ending his naziriteship, only after 120 days. This is because he might have been a full-fledged leper, which means that his shavings count toward his leprosy, not his naziriteship. Consequently, after the first sixty days he must observe another thirty days of naziriteship and shave again. Even then he has yet to fulfill all his obligations, as he might have been impure from a corpse, which means his shaving after ninety days was for his impurity. He must therefore remain a nazirite for another thirty days, before shaving one final time at the end of 120 days to fulfill his naziriteship obligation. The mishna notes: The reason that he cannot shave for his leprosy after seven days and perform the second shaving of a leper seven days later is because the shaving of leprosy overrides the prohibition of the shaving of a nazirite only when his status as a leper is definite. However, when his status as a leper is uncertain, the shaving does not override his naziriteship, and therefore he must wait thirty days before each of his shavings for leprosy.

9:1 Gentiles do not have naziriteship, i.e., the halakhot of naziriteship do not apply to gentiles. They are not subject to the prohibitions of a nazirite, nor does one accept their offerings at the end of naziriteship. However, women and Canaanite slaves do have naziriteship. The mishna adds: There is a greater stringency in the case of women than in the case of slaves, as a master may force his slave to drink wine, shave his hair, or become ritually impure from a corpse, despite the slave's vow of naziriteship, but a husband cannot force his wife to transgress her naziriteship. The previous mishna taught that the naziriteship of women includes a stringency that does not apply to slaves. This mishna adds: There is a greater stringency in the case of slaves than in the case of women, as a man can nullify the vows of his wife but he cannot nullify the vows of his slave, despite the fact that he can prevent him from fulfilling them in practice. Similarly, if he nullified the naziriteship of his wife it is permanently nullified, and it remains nullified even if she is later divorced or widowed. Conversely, if he nullified the naziriteship of his slave by forcing him to violate the terms of his vow of naziriteship, when the slave is emancipated he completes his naziriteship. In a case where a slave took a vow of naziriteship but was prevented by his master from fulfilling the terms of his vow, the Sages engaged in a dispute what the halakha would be if he

permanently left his master's presence, i.e., he ran away without being emancipated. Rabbi Meir says: He may not drink wine. Since the slave is free in practice, his vow goes into effect. And Rabbi Yosei says: He may drink wine, as he is not emancipated.

9:2 With regard to a nazirite who shaved for the conclusion of his naziriteship, and it later became known to him that during his naziriteship he was ritually impure from a corpse, if it was a known impurity, i.e., people were aware of the impurity when he became impure, he negates his entire naziriteship. And if it was ritual impurity imparted by a grave in the depths, one that was unknown at the time, he does not negate his naziriteship. If he discovered he was impure before he shaved, he negates his naziriteship in either case. The mishna asks: How does one differentiate between a known and an unknown impurity? If a nazirite descended to immerse in a cave, and a corpse was found floating at the mouth of the cave, he is impure, as an openly visible corpse is a known impurity. What, then, is an impurity of the depths? This is referring to a case where the corpse was found sunk into the ground of the cave in such a manner that it was unknown. However, even here the circumstances of the case must be taken into account. If one descended not to immerse himself in the water, as he was ritually pure, but to cool himself, he remains pure. If he was impure and entered the water to purify himself from the impurity from a corpse, he is impure. The reason is that something that has the presumptive status of impurity remains impure, and something that has the presumptive status of purity is pure, as there is a basis for the matter. It is reasonable that items or people retain their presumptive status.

9:3 One who finds a corpse for the first time, i.e., he discovers a single corpse in a place that was not previously established as a cemetery, if the corpse is lying in the usual manner of Jewish burial, he removes it from there and also its surrounding earth. It is assumed that this corpse was buried there alone. There is no concern that this area is a cemetery and therefore the corpse may not be moved, nor does one take into account the possibility that another corpse may be buried in the vicinity. Similarly, if he found two corpses, he removes them and their surrounding earth. In a case where he found three corpses, if there is a space between this corpse and that corpse of four to eight cubits, in a standard design, this is a graveyard. There is a concern that this might be an ancient cemetery. One must therefore examine from that spot outward for twenty cubits. If one finds another corpse at the end of twenty cubits, he examines from that spot outward twenty cubits, as there is a basis for anticipating the matter. It is likely that he has stumbled upon an ancient gravesite. He is not permitted to relocate the corpses, despite the fact that if he had found the single corpse by itself at first he could have removed it and its surrounding earth.

9:4 Any case of uncertainty with regard to leprous sores is initially deemed pure until it is established that it is a case of ritual impurity. Once it has been determined to be a case of impurity, uncertainty concerning it is deemed impure. This mishna discusses another case that includes the statement: There is a basis to anticipate the matter. One examines a man who experienced a gonorrhea-like discharge [zav] in seven ways, as long as he has not been

confirmed as having a gonorrhoea-like discharge [ziva.] With regard to an individual's second such discharge, before he has been established as a greater zav, one examines to see whether there may have been a particular trigger of his discharge. One examines him with regard to food and with regard to drink, in case the discharge might have been the result of overeating or excess drinking; with regard to a burden, as it might have been caused by the weight of a heavy burden; and with regard to jumping, in case he jumped and this led to the discharge; and with regard to sickness; and with regard to an arousing sight; and with regard to the thought of a woman. Once he has been confirmed as having a ziva, after two definite discharges of ziva, one no longer examines him in this way, as any discharge is deemed impure. If one experiences three discharges of ziva, he is obligated to bring an offering following his purification. Accordingly, his discharge that was due to circumstances beyond his control, i.e., for one of the seven reasons listed above, and his discharge about which it is uncertain if it is ziva, and even his semen, which is not usually considered the discharge of a zav, are all impure. Why is this so? It is because there is a basis for anticipating the matter. Once he has the status of a zav, it can be assumed that subsequent discharges are of ziva as well. The Sages similarly taught: With regard to one who strikes another with heavy blows, and doctors assessed that he would die as a result of the beating, but his health improved from what it was, so that they then determined that he would not die from his injuries, and afterward his condition worsened and he died, the one who struck him is liable to receive court-imposed capital punishment, as it is assumed that the victim's death was caused by the assault. Rabbi Nehemya says: He is exempt, because there is a basis for anticipating the matter. Since the victim began to recover during his illness, it is reasonable to assume that his death was caused by a factor other than the assault.

9:5 The tractate concludes with an aggadic statement about nazirites. Samuel the prophet was a nazirite, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Nehorai, as it was stated that when Hannah, his mother, prayed for a son, she vowed: "And no mora shall come upon his head" (I Samuel 1:11). How is it derived that mora is an expression of naziriteship? It is stated with regard to Samson: "And no razor [mora] shall come upon his head, for the child shall be a nazirite to God" (Judges 13:5), and it is stated: "And no mora," with regard to Samuel. Just as the term "mora" that is stated with regard to Samson means that he was a nazirite, so too the term "mora" that is stated with regard to Samuel indicates that he was a nazirite. Rabbi Yosei said: But doesn't the word "mora" mean nothing other than the fear of flesh and blood? The word should be read as though it were written with an alef, and not a heh, so that it means fear. Rabbi Nehorai said to him: But isn't it already stated: "And Samuel said: How can I go; if Saul hears it he will kill me" (I Samuel 16:2). This verse indicates that there was fear of flesh and blood upon Samuel. Consequently, the term mora must be understood in accordance with its plain meaning of a razor. If so, Samuel was indeed a nazirite.