

וְתִבְעֵי לִיהַ נְזִירוֹת מוּעֲטָת! חֲדָא מְגוּ
חֲדָא קָא מִיבְעִינָא לִיהַ;

The Gemara asks: **And let him raise this dilemma** with regard to a short term of naziriteship, when fewer than thirty days would remain if he suspended the first term of naziriteship in order to observe the other. The Gemara answers: **He raises one dilemma as a result of the other.** In other words, Rava's question was an outgrowth of a different inquiry, which in turn led to his question. The full discussion is as follows:

Perek II
Daf 14 Amud a

HALAKHA

A short naziriteship, etc. – נְזִירוֹת מוּעֲטָת וכו': If one says: I am hereby a nazirite after twenty days and a nazirite from now, he observes a term of naziriteship of thirty days, shaves, and then observes a second term of thirty days for the naziriteship that was to commence after twenty days. This is because if he counts twenty and stops for the second term of naziriteship, only ten days would remain for the completion of his first term, and there must be at least thirty days between each shaving (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 4:7 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

I am hereby a nazirite after twenty, etc. – הֲרִינִי נְזִיר – לְאַחַר עֶשְׂרִים וכו': If one said: I am hereby a nazirite after twenty days, and then said: I am a permanent nazirite from now, the naziriteship of his first vow does not take effect (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 4:8 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

אם תמצוי לומר נזירות מועטת, כִּינן
דְּעֵשְׂרֵה יוֹמִין הוּא דִּיִּתְרִין – לָא סְלִיק
לִיהַ הַלִּין עֲשְׂרֵה; וְדָאִי נְזִיר מֵאַה יוֹם,
כִּינן דְּאִית לִיהַ תְּמִנָּן יוֹמִין לְבִסּוּף –
סְלִקִין לִיהַ, אוּ לֵא?

If you say that when he accepts naziriteship upon himself after twenty days, and then vows a short term of naziriteship^h of thirty days starting now, then since, if he pauses from his first term of naziriteship after twenty days, it is only ten days that are left over to complete after the second term of naziriteship, those ten should not be reckoned for him to complete a full term of naziriteship. Ten days are insufficient for hair growth. Therefore, he must observe a full thirty-day term of naziriteship after the second term of naziriteship, which means he is not a nazirite for the first twenty days. With that assumption in mind, the question arose: **Certainly** if he vows to be a nazirite for one hundred days, since he has a further eighty days at the end, which is sufficient time for his hair to grow, do the first twenty days count for him as part of the one hundred days or not?

וְאם תמצוי לומר חיילי, אָמַר "הֲרִינִי
נְזִיר לְאַחַר עֶשְׂרִים יוֹם וּמֵעַבְשָׁיו נְזִיר
עוֹלָם" מֵהוּ? מִי חֵיילָא עֲלִיהַ אוּ לֵא?

This inquiry leads to yet another question: **And if you say** that the first days of naziriteship take effect,ⁿ and his term of naziriteship will be completed in the eighty days after the second term of naziriteship, then if he said: **I am hereby a nazirite after twenty^h days, and from now I am a permanent nazirite, what is the halakha? Does the permanent naziriteship take effect for him during those twenty days or not?** Since permanent naziriteship is unlimited, he could not have intended to complete its days after the second term of naziriteship, and it is reasonable to assume that he intended for the permanent naziriteship to begin after the second term of naziriteship has been completed.

NOTES

וְאם תמצוי לומר חיילי – And if you say that they take effect: At this point the Gemara expands Rava's question: Even if the previous problem is resolved by saying that a term of naziriteship that cannot be completed before the second term of naziriteship starts should nevertheless commence at once, it is possible that this is so only because both terms of naziriteship are of limited duration. Moreover, since they can be completed consecutively, the first one takes immediate effect.

If, however, one of the terms of naziriteship is unlimited, this means that once he begins it the second term of naziriteship can never take effect, and even if it could take effect, he cannot shave at its conclusion (Rabbeinu Peretz). The Rosh explains that when there are two terms of naziriteship that last for a specific period of time, neither of them is viewed as an interruption of the other, whereas a permanent naziriteship represents an entirely different category.

אם תמצוי לומר, הֲכֵא בִּינֵן דְּאִפְשָׁר לְאַיְתְּשׁוּלֵי – חֵיילָא, אָמַר "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁמִשׁוֹן לְאַחַר עֶשְׂרִים יוֹם וּמַעֲבָשׁוֹ נְזִיר סֵתָם" מֵהוּ? הֲכֵא לָא אִפְשָׁר לְאַיְתְּשׁוּלֵי – מִי חֵיילָא אוּ לָא? אָמַר "כְּמִשָּׁה בְּשַׁבְּעָה בְּאֶדְר". מֵאִי?

If you say: Here, with regard to cases of a standard permanent naziriteship after twenty days, since it is possible to request of a halakhic authority to dissolve the vow, which would result in the first term of naziriteship taking full effect, it therefore takes effect during those twenty days, then the following question arises: If one said: I am hereby a nazirite like Samson^{NHB} after twenty days, and from now I am hereby a nazirite without specification, what is the halakha? Since here it is not possible to request of a halakhic authority to dissolve the vow of naziriteship like Samson, and there is no way of completing the first term of naziriteship, does the first naziriteship take effect or not? The Gemara adds another question: If one said: I am hereby like Moses on the seventh day of Adar,^N what is the halakha? Is this considered an expression of naziriteship in that just as Moses passed away on that date and drank no more wine, so too, the speaker vows to be a nazirite? Alternatively, perhaps this phrase does not indicate the acceptance of naziriteship.

פְּשׁוּט מִיַּנְיָהוּ קְדַמְיָתָא: "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר לְאַחַר עֶשְׂרִים יוֹם וּמַעֲבָשׁוֹ מֵאָה יוֹם" – מוֹנָה עֶשְׂרִים, וְאַחַר כֵּךְ מוֹנָה שְׁלֹשִׁים, וְאַחַר כֵּךְ מוֹנָה שְׁמוֹנִים, כְּדִי לְהַשְׁלִים נְזִירוֹת רֵאשׁוֹנָה.

The Gemara comments: At least resolve the first of these questions, the one raised at the beginning of the discussion, as it is stated explicitly in the *Tosefta* (2:5): If one says: I am hereby a nazirite after twenty days, and I am hereby a nazirite from now for one hundred days, he counts twenty days of his term of naziriteship immediately, after which he counts thirty days for the subsequent term of naziriteship, and afterward he counts eighty days in order to complete his first term of naziriteship.

נְטָמָא בְּיַמֵּי בְּנֵו, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: סוֹתֵר, רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: אֵינֵו סוֹתֵר.

§ The Gemara returns to its discussion of the statement of the mishna with regard to one who vowed to be a nazirite upon the birth of a son in addition to a standard term of naziriteship. The mishna ruled that he begins his term of naziriteship, and if he has a son during that term, he pauses from that term of naziriteship and starts the term for his son, after which he completes the first term. The Torah states that a nazirite who becomes impure while observing his term of naziriteship must start counting afresh, which leads to the following question: What happens if he became impure during the days of his term of naziriteship for his son?^H Rabbi Yohanan says: This negates all of it, even the days he has counted for his own term of naziriteship, and he must observe two full terms of naziriteship. Reish Lakish says: This does not negate the days he observed for his own term of naziriteship, only those of the term of naziriteship for his son.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: סוֹתֵר, חֲדָא נְזִירוֹת אַרְיֹבְתָא הֵיא. רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: אֵינֵו סוֹתֵר, נְזִירוֹת דִּידֵיהּ לְחוּד, וְדַבְרֵיהּ לְחוּד.

The Gemara clarifies the two approaches: Rabbi Yohanan says it negates all of it, since he holds that it is one long term of naziriteship.^N Reish Lakish says it does not negate the days he observed for his own term of naziriteship because his term of naziriteship is a discrete naziriteship, and that for his son is a discrete naziriteship.

I am hereby a nazirite like Samson, etc. – הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁמִשׁוֹן – וְכוּ: If one said: I am hereby a nazirite like Samson after twenty days, and subsequently said: I am hereby a nazirite from now, he does not shave at the completion of the term of naziriteship observed due to his second vow, as he is then a nazirite like Samson (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 4:9 and see *Kesef Mishneh* there).

He became impure during the days of his son – נְטָמָא בְּיַמֵּי בְּנֵו: If one vowed to be a nazirite upon the birth of his son, and then took a vow of a standard term of naziriteship beginning immediately, he starts the latter term of naziriteship at once. If he has a son before completing his term, he observes the term of naziriteship for his son and afterward completes his term of naziriteship. These two terms of naziriteship are considered a single term, and if he became impure during the term of naziriteship for his son all of the days are negated. This is because the halakha is generally ruled in accordance with Rabbi Yohanan's opinion in opposition to Reish Lakish. If one became impure during the final days of his own term of naziriteship, after the term of naziriteship for his son was completed, he forfeits only the latter days. The Ra'avad maintains that he also forfeits the first days of his own term of naziriteship (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 4:3).

BACKGROUND

A nazirite like Samson – נְזִיר שְׁמִשׁוֹן: According to some authorities, one who takes a vow to be a nazirite like Samson is not a nazirite at all, since Samson himself did not take a vow of naziriteship (see Judges, chapter 13); however, others set norms for a nazirite like Samson. They permit him to become ritually impure by coming in contact with dead bodies, thereby freeing him from the obligation to bring the special nazirite offerings if he becomes ritually impure, but they prohibit him from cutting his hair or drinking wine. Such a nazirite vow is permanent, and some hold that it cannot be dissolved.

NOTES

I am hereby a nazirite like Samson, etc. – הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁמִשׁוֹן וְכוּ: The Sages had a tradition that one cannot request to have a naziriteship of this type dissolved (Rabbeinu Peretz). The Commentary on *Nazir* explains that this is because Samson himself never vowed to be a nazirite but rather had it imposed upon him by an angel; therefore, he could not request its dissolution. Consequently, one who vows to be a nazirite like Samson has no option of dissolution.

Like Moses on the seventh day of Adar, etc. – כְּמִשָּׁה בְּשַׁבְּעָה – בְּאֶדְר וְכוּ: The *Keren Ora* is puzzled by the placement of this question, which appears unrelated to the previous questions. Rabbeinu Peretz explains simply that this question is in fact unconnected to the other ones, and is mentioned here only as one of a series of unresolved questions.

The Meiri claims that this problem is related to the case of a naziriteship like Samson. In both situations one is stating a vow of naziriteship by comparing himself to someone who did not drink wine, but not as a result of a vow of naziriteship. Samson's naziriteship did not come about through a vow, and Moses' refraining from wine also was not the result of a vow. When one links his naziriteship to the behavior of a person who refrains from drinking wine due to illness or a similar reason, the

vow does not take effect. The question in the Gemara is whether that halakha applies to the comparison to Moses, or whether the case of one who compares himself to Moses has the same halakha as that of a naziriteship like Samson.

With regard to what the uncertainty is when he says: The seventh of Adar, most commentaries (*Tosafot*; Rosh; Rabbeinu Todros; Rabbeinu Azriel, citing Rabbeinu Tam) explain that it is uncertain whether or not he had naziriteship in mind. On the one hand, since Moses died on the seventh of Adar, it is possible that many Jews decided to be nazirites as an expression of mourning, since, like a mourner, a nazirite may not drink wine or shave. On the other hand, the one in question might have intended to celebrate that day in honor of the birth of Moses, which occurred on the same date, and did not intend to accept upon himself naziriteship or any other prohibition. The Commentary on *Nazir* explains that just as Moses himself did not drink wine from the day of his death onward, this person vows that wine is forbidden to him as well. The Meiri suggests that Moses did not drink wine on the day of his death, as he was presumably not focused on his physical needs on that day.

It is one long term of naziriteship – חֲדָא נְזִירוֹת אַרְיֹבְתָא הֵיא: The early commentaries explain that this naziriteship is considered one long term, even though it contains both his own term of naziriteship as well as the one for his son, because he does not shave until the conclusion of the entire period. *Tosafot* claim that Rabbi Yohanan said it is a long term of naziriteship and one forfeits the entire period only if he became impure during the days of the naziriteship for his son, in which case it also negates the first period he had observed for his own term of naziriteship. However, if he became impure during the period in which he completes his term of naziriteship, after the completion of the term of naziriteship for his son, he does not forfeit the days of the term of naziriteship for his son but only the first days he had counted for his own term of naziriteship. In contrast, the Rambam rules that if one became impure during those last days, not only does it not negate the term of naziriteship for his son, but even the earlier days he observed for his own term of naziriteship remain valid. The *Keren Ora* writes that the Rambam here is consistent with his approach that one must shave after concluding the term of naziriteship for his son, which means the two parts of his own term of naziriteship are linked only by the numbering of days. They are not considered a single unit with regard to negation.

BACKGROUND

Leprosy [tzara'at] – צִרְעָת: Traditionally rendered as leprosy, the term *tzara'at* used in the Torah is not necessarily the equivalent of the disease known by that name. The Torah term refers to symptoms that cause severe ritual impurity. The *halakhot* governing these symptoms are articulated at length in Leviticus, chapters 13–15, and in the Mishna in tractate *Nega'im*. Leprosy can be contracted on skin, hair, articles of clothing, and houses. When a symptom appears, it is examined by a priest, and only a priest is authorized to determine whether to quarantine the affected person for a certain period or to declare immediately that the symptom is or is not leprosy. Leprosy is one of the primary sources of ritual impurity, and it is particularly severe in that it imparts ritual impurity to items found in the same enclosure with it, like the impurity imparted by corpses. One afflicted with leprosy in the wilderness was sent out of the Israelite camp, and once the Jewish people entered Eretz Yisrael, out of his town or city. He must live in solitude until his affliction is cured. A cured leper undergoes certain rites outside the city and a purification ceremony in the Temple itself. He is obligated to bring specific offerings as part of his purification.

NOTES

On the day of hair growth – בְּיוֹם גִּידוּל שֵׁעַר: There are different opinions with regard to this case. Most early commentaries explain that the Gemara is referring to a person who shaved his hair during his naziriteship either against his will or because he contracted leprosy. Although the shaving does not cause him to forfeit his previous days of naziriteship, he is nevertheless required to observe a period of thirty days so that his hair can grow enough for shaving.

Rav and Shmuel have a dispute with regard to the *halakha* of one who became impure during this additional period of hair growth. Rav maintains that Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish would both agree that these days are not considered part of his naziriteship, since he has already counted the requisite number of days. Conversely, Shmuel argues that since these days serve to complete his naziriteship they are viewed as an integral part of it (*Tosafot*; Rosh; Rabbeinu Peretz; Rabbeinu Todros). The Commentary on *Nazir* offers an alternative explanation which suggests a similar approach. It states that the Gemara is referring to a nazirite who became impure and, after becoming pure again, began counting a new full term of naziriteship as required. He then became impure during the period added to his naziriteship due to the first impurity. In this case, Rav and Shmuel disagree over whether these days can be viewed as merely an addition to the previous naziriteship, or whether they are considered part of the naziriteship itself since the previous days were negated.

In contrast to this, some commentaries maintain that the phrase: The day of his hair growth, should be understood literally as referring to a particular day. Therefore, the Commentary on *Nazir*'s initial interpretation explains that the case is of one who vowed to be a nazirite for one hundred days, and after seventy days passed he contracted leprosy, was cured, and resumed his naziriteship. He shaved on the one hundredth day, and on the very day that he completed his term became a leper again. According to this approach, everyone agrees that he negates the last thirty days, and the dispute concerns the status of the first seventy.

In *Sefer HaYashar*, Rabbeinu Tam writes that Rav agrees with the opinion that one who became impure on the day of the completion of his term of naziriteship has to repeat only thirty days, and the words: It does not negate, mean it does not negate it all. The Meiri states that if one became impure on the day of his offerings, which occurs on the day after the completion of his naziriteship, he forfeits at least thirty days. It is the day after this that is called: The day of hair growth, and since this day is not part of his naziriteship even by rabbinic decree, Rav maintains that it does not negate his term if he became impure on that day.

נִטְמָא בְּיָמֵי צִרְעָתוֹ, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: סוֹתֵר, רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: אֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: סוֹתֵר, דְּהָא בְּנִירוֹת קָאִי. רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: אֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר, צִרְעַת לְחוּד וּנְיִירוֹת לְחוּד.

וְצִרְיָא, דְּאִי אֵיתְמַר בְּהַךְ קַמְיִתָּא – בְּהֵיא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן סוֹתֵר, שֵׁם נְיִירוֹת אַחַת הֵיא, אֲבָל בְּהָא – אֵימָא מוֹדָה לִיה לְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ, דְּנִיֵּיר לְחוּד וְצִרְעַת לְחוּד.

וְאִי אֵיתְמַר בְּהָא – בְּהָא קְאָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ, אֲבָל בְּהַךְ – אֵימָא מוֹדָה לִיה לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן, צִרְיָא.

נִטְמָא בְּיוֹם גִּידוּל שֵׁעַר, רַב אָמַר: אֵינוֹ סוֹתֵר; אֲפִילוּ לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן דְּאָמַר סוֹתֵר – הֵנִי מִיְלֵי הֵיכָא דְקָאִי בְּנִירוֹת, גִּידוּל שֵׁעַר – מִיִּשְׁלָם נְיִירוֹת הוּא.

These two *amora'im* have a similar dispute in the case of one who contracted leprosy during his naziriteship and became impure by coming into contact with corpse during the days of his leprosy.^{BH} Although the days of his leprosy do not negate the previous days of his naziriteship, they are not counted as part of his naziriteship either. **Rabbi Yoḥanan says:** Contraction of impurity from a corpse negates the days of naziriteship observed before his leprosy, which means he must start counting afresh once he is purified of leprosy. **Reish Lakish says:** It does not negate the days he has observed, and he need observe only the remaining days of his naziriteship after his purification.

The Gemara clarifies their respective approaches. **Rabbi Yoḥanan says** the impurity from a corpse negates the days he already observed, since he remains in a period of naziriteship even when he is a leper, as his leprosy does not negate his naziriteship. **Reish Lakish says it does not negate** the days he observed, since he maintains that leprosy is discrete and naziriteship is discrete. One's time as a leper is not considered part of his naziriteship.

The Gemara comments: **And it is necessary to teach this dispute in both cases. As, if it were stated in this first one,** with regard to one who became impure during his term of naziriteship for the birth of his son, one might say that it is specifically in that case that **Rabbi Yoḥanan said it also negates** the days of his standard naziriteship because there is one label of naziriteship that applies to both vows, but in this case, where the leper became impure from a corpse, one might say he concedes to Reish Lakish that it does not negate the days of his naziriteship that he has counted, since a nazirite is discrete and leprosy is discrete.

And conversely, if it were stated only in this case, that of the leper who contracted impurity from a corpse, one might say that it is only in this case that **Reish Lakish said it does not negate** his days of naziriteship, but in that case, where one became impure while observing the term of naziriteship for his son, one might say he concedes to **Rabbi Yoḥanan** that it negates the entire period, since they are all days of naziriteship. Therefore, it is necessary for the dispute to be taught in both cases.

In connection with the dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish, the Gemara discusses the case of a nazirite who became impure on the day of his hair growth.^{BH} The case is that of one who contracted leprosy during his naziriteship and then was purified from his condition and shaved, as required of him. At this point he must wait another thirty days so that his hair can grow enough for him to shave it for the end of his naziriteship. If he became impure during this additional period, **Rav said:** It does not negate the days he previously counted for his naziriteship. The Gemara explains: **Even according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who says that if one became impure during the days of the term of naziriteship for his son it negates the entire period, this statement applies only where he still remains in a period of naziriteship, but the time of hair growth is an addition to his period of naziriteship and is not considered part of the term itself.**

HALAKHA

נִטְמָא בְּיָמֵי צִרְעָתוֹ – Became impure during the days of his leprosy – צִרְעָתוֹ: A nazirite with leprosy who later contracts impurity from a corpse forfeits all his previous days of naziriteship because he is still considered a nazirite, despite the impurity of the leprosy (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:10).

נִטְמָא בְּיוֹם גִּידוּל שֵׁעַר – Became impure on the day of hair growth – שֵׁעַר: If a nazirite completes his term of naziriteship and on the following day, when he may grow his hair, he becomes impure, he does not forfeit any part of his naziriteship even if he has yet to shave, since his period of naziriteship is over. The *halakha* is in accordance with Rav in opposition to Shmuel in matters of ritual law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:5 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

תגלחת לא מעבבת – Shaving is not indispensable: If a nazirite has completed his days of naziriteship and brought his offerings, the fact that he has not yet shaved does not preclude the conclusion of his naziriteship. Rather, he may drink wine and contract impurity from a corpse after nightfall, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:5).

NOTES

לוקה על – He is flogged for the contracting of impurity – *הטומאה*: Even Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, agrees that one does not forfeit his period of naziriteship, since he has already counted the requisite number of days (*Tosafot*).

ושמואל אמר: סותר; אפילו לריש לקיש דאמר אין סותר – התם שתי נזירות, הכא חדא נזירותא.

And Shmuel said: It negates the earlier days. The Gemara explains: Even according to Reish Lakish, who says that becoming impure during the naziriteship for his son **does not negate** the days of his naziriteship, **there** it is referring to a case of **two** distinct terms of **naziriteship**, a standard one for himself and another for his son. But **here** it is **one naziriteship**, since the days he observes for the growth of his hair complete his naziriteship.

אמר רב חסדא: הכל מודים שאם קדש שער בדם – אין לו תקנה.

Rav Hisda said: All concede that if the hair was consecrated during the sprinkling of the blood, he has no means of remedy. That is, if the nazirite had completed his term and brought his offerings, and the blood of the offerings was sprinkled, and he then became impure before shaving, he has no way to shave or to render wine permitted to himself. It has not been permitted through the offerings he brought because he has become impure, and he cannot bring other offerings for this purpose since one may not bring two sets of offerings for the same term of naziriteship.

אליבא דמאן? אי אליבא דרבי אליעזר, בין דאמר תגלחת מעבבת – תוך מלאת היא, ולסתור! אלא אליבא דרבנן – האמרי תגלחת לא מעבבת! לעולם אליבא דרבנן, ומאי "אין לו תקנה" – אין לו תקנה למצות גילוח.

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion did Rav Hisda state this *halakha*? If one says that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, this cannot be, since Rabbi Eliezer said that shaving is indispensable to the completion of naziriteship. The impurity is therefore contracted within the full term of his naziriteship, in which case it would not make sense that he has no remedy; but let it instead negate his days of naziriteship, and he will observe them again, after which he will shave. Rather, perhaps Rav Hisda spoke in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis; didn't they say that shaving is not indispensable^h to the completion of naziriteship, which means his impurity occurred when he was no longer a nazirite? The Gemara answers: Actually, Rav Hisda ruled in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and what is the meaning of: He has no means of remedy? It means: He has no means of remedy for the mitzva of shaving, i.e., he cannot fulfill the mitzva of shaving in purity as required.

אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: נזיר שכלו לו ימיו – לוקה על הטומאה, ואינו לוקה על התגלחת ולא על היין. מאי שנא טומאה דלקי – דאמר קרא "כל ימי היזרו לה" לרבות ימים שלאחר מלאת בימים שלפני מלאת.

Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: A nazirite whose days of naziriteship are completed but who has yet to bring his offerings is flogged for the contracting of impurityⁿ if he becomes impure from a corpse, like any nazirite who becomes impure, but he is not flogged for the act of shaving, nor for the drinking of wine. The Gemara asks: What is different with regard to impurity that he is flogged for it? It is as the verse states: "All the days that he has consecrated himself unto the Lord he shall not come near to a dead body" (Numbers 6:6). The additional word "all" comes to include the days after the completion of his naziriteship and teaches that they are like the days before its completion with regard to the prohibition against contracting impurity from the dead. Therefore, he is liable to receive lashes.

אי הכי אתגלחת נמי ליחייב, דהא אמר רחמנא "כל ימי נזרו תער לא יעבר על ראשו" – לעשות ימים שלאחר מלאת בימים שלפני מלאת! ותו: "כל ימי נזרו מכל אשר יעשה מגפן היין" – לעשות ימים שלאחר מלאת בימים שלפני מלאת!

The Gemara asks: If so, let him also be liable to receive lashes for shaving, since the Merciful One states in the Torah: "All the days of his vow of naziriteship there shall no razor come upon his head" (Numbers 6:5). Here too, the word "all" should render the days after the completion of his naziriteship like the days before its completion. And furthermore, with regard to wine as well, the verse states: "All the days of his naziriteship, from anything that is made of the grapevine, from the pressed grapes even to the grapestone, he shall not eat" (Numbers 6:4). Once again, the word "all" should render the days after the completion of his naziriteship like the days before its completion with regard to drinking wine. What is the reason for the difference in *halakha* between contracting impurity on the one hand, and shaving and drinking wine on the other?