

מה נפשוך; אי סתר – כולו סתר, אי לא סתר – לא נסתור ולא ימו! אלא אימא: לא נסתור ולא ימו.

The Gemara expresses surprise: **Whichever way you look at Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement, it is difficult. If this discharge negates clean days just as the case of a *zava* who had a discharge during his seven days, it should negate all his clean days, not only the last one. If it does not negate clean days, since it is not considered a discharge within his seven days but rather, as the first sighting of a new *ziva*, it should not negate any of it, and not even its own day.** What, then, is the logic of Rabbi Yoḥanan's ruling that it negates a single day? **Rather, say instead that Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: It does not negate at all, and not even its own day, since this discharge is considered to be the first of a new series.**

Perek II
Daf 16 Amud a

NOTES

And as to Rabbi Yosei, now, he holds that the status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, etc. – ורבי יוסי: Although the Gemara had concluded earlier that the reason for Rabbi Yosei's ruling was not because he holds that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day but because she becomes impure only from now onward, that answer is a forced one (Commentary on *Nazir*; Rabbi Avraham min HaHar, citing Rashi). However, according to the opinion of *Tosafot* that the principle that part of a day is like all of a day is consistent with the principle that she becomes impure from here onward, the Gemara's question here is readily understood (see *Tosafot* and Rabbeinu Peretz).

A full-fledged *zava* – זבה גמורה: A full-fledged *zava* is a woman who has seen blood on three consecutive days, in which case she is required to observe seven clean days and bring an offering upon her purification.

The other half of the day – איך פלגיה דיומא: There are two explanations for this statement. One interpretation is that even Rabbi Yosei agrees that she is at least considered ritually impure for the rest of the day on which she saw blood. However, since the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, if she were to discharge blood, for example, at noon for two consecutive days, the morning hours of the second day would be considered a clean day in between the days of impurity (*Rosh*). Other commentaries claim that since the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, there is no difference between the beginning and the end of a day, and the hours until nightfall following her impurity would be viewed as a break between discharges (see Commentary on *Nazir*; *Tosafot*). *Tosafot* state that the different approaches result partly from alternative interpretations of the phrase: The other half of the day.

Close to sunset – סמוך לשקיעת החמה: In other words, she was experiencing a discharge during the entire twilight, beginning just before sunset and continuing into the start of the night. If this occurs at the end of both the first and second days, the night of the third day is also included, and she is therefore impure for three days (*Tosafot*). The commentaries point out that in that case, the hours between the discharges cannot be viewed as a clean day, even if one holds that part of the day is like all of a day, since this principle applies only to the start of the day, or, according to some opinions, the end of a day as well. The middle of a day certainly cannot be considered like all of a day (see Meiri).

ואמר ליה: רבי יוסי קאי בותיך, דאמר: מבאן ולהבא משמא. והא רבי יוסי למפרע הוא דאמר! מאי למפרע – מדרבנן.

And Rabbi Oshaya said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: **Rabbi Yosei holds in accordance with your opinion, as he too says that in this case one becomes impure from now and onward, and any impurity after the start of the seventh day does not cause him to forfeit the previous clean days.** The Gemara analyzes Rabbi Oshaya's statement: **But didn't Rabbi Yosei say that the impurity is retroactive, as stated above? Rather, Rabbi Oshaya must certainly hold as follows: What is the meaning of Rabbi Yosei's ruling that he is impure retroactively? It means that he is rendered impure only by rabbinic law, but not by Torah law.**

ורבי יוסי, מכדי סבר מקצת היום ככולו, זבה גמורה דמיינתא קרבן היכי משפחת לה? בין דחויא בפלגיה דיומא – איך פלגיה דיומא: סליק לה לשימור. איבעית אימא: דקא שפעה תלתא תלתא יומי בהדי הדדי, ואיבעית אימא: דחויא תלתא יומי סמוך לשקיעת החמה, דלא הואי שהות דסליק ליה למנינא.

הדרן עלך הריני נויר

The Gemara poses a question with regard to Rabbi Yosei's statement: **And as to Rabbi Yosei, now, he holds that the status of part of the day is like that of an entire day.^N How can you find a full-fledged *zava*^N who brings an offering? Since she sees a discharge at the midpoint of the day, the other half of the day^N counts for her as a full day of observing, as part of the day is considered to be like all of a day.** The Gemara answers: **If you wish, say that she continuously discharges blood for three days consecutively. And if you wish, say that she saw a discharge on three consecutive days close to sunset.^N In that case she is impure on each occasion at the end of one day and the beginning of the next, so that there was not any time to become pure on the following day so as to be included for her counting of a clean day corresponding to an impure one.**

מתני' מי שאמר "הריני נזיר" – מגלח יום שלשים ואחד, ואם גילח ליום שלשים – יצא. "הריני נזיר שלשים יום" – אם גילח ליום שלשים – לא יצא.

מי שצוה שתי נזירות – מגלח את הראשונה יום שלשים ואחד, ואת השנייה יום ששים ואחד, ואם גילח את הראשונה יום שלשים – מגלח את השנייה יום ששים, ואם גילח יום ששים חסר אחד – יצא.

וזו עדות העיד רבי פפייס על מי שצוה שתי נזירות, שאם גילח את הראשונה יום שלשים – מגלח את השנייה ליום ששים, ואם גילח ליום ששים חסר אחד – יצא, שיום של שלשים עולה לו מן המנין.

מי שאמר "הריני נזיר" – נטמא יום שלשים – סותר את הכל, רבי אליעזר אומר: אינו סותר אלא שבעה. "הריני נזיר שלשים יום" – נטמא יום שלשים – סותר את הכל. "הריני נזיר מאה יום" – נטמא יום מאה – סותר את הכל. רבי אליעזר אומר: אינו סותר אלא שלשים. נטמא יום מאה ואחד – סותר שלשים יום, רבי אליעזר אומר: אינו סותר אלא שבעה.

גמ' "מי שאמר הריני נזיר ונטמא יום שלשים – סותר את הכל, רבי אליעזר אומר: אינו סותר אלא שבעה."

MISHNA One who said: I am hereby a nazirite,^{NH} 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.

One who accepted two terms of naziriteship^H 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,^P 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.

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^{NH} of his term of naziriteship, it negates the entire tally, and he must start his naziriteship afresh. Rabbi Eliezer says: It negates only seven^N 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.** 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^H 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.**

GEMARA The mishna taught: **One who said: I am hereby a nazirite, and became ritually impure on the thirtieth day, it negates the entire tally; Rabbi Eliezer says: It negates only seven.**

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Pappeyas – רבי פפייס: We know little about Rabbi Pappeyas beyond the fact that he offers firsthand testimony about the activities that took place during the Second Temple period. Almost every time he is quoted in the Mishna, *Tosefta*, and Babylonian Talmud his statements relate to the Temple

and the Temple service. There is a Sage with the name Rabbi Pappeyas who is quoted in halakhic midrash as disagreeing with Rabbi Akiva, but it is likely another scholar with the same name, inasmuch as Rabbi Akiva's academy was established several generations after the destruction of the Second Temple.

NOTES

מי שאמר הריני נזיר – One who said I am hereby a nazirite – There is a dispute between bar Padda and Rav Mattana with regard to the source for the *halakha* that an unspecified naziriteship is for thirty days. The Gemara there (5a) cites this mishna and interprets it in accordance with both opinions.

נטמא יום – Became ritually impure on the thirtieth day – **שלשים:** According to Rav Mattana's opinion that a term of naziriteship lasts for thirty days, the previous days are voided by Torah law, and he must bring the offerings of ritual impurity. Bar Padda, who maintains that as a matter of Torah law a term of naziriteship consists of only twenty-nine days, explains that the previous days are negated due to a decree of the Sages, and he does not bring the offerings of ritual impurity (*Tosafot*).

אינו סותר אלא שבעה – It negates only seven – He is not considered a ritually impure nazirite, who is required to bring certain offerings after his seven days of purification and to start his naziriteship afresh. According to Rav Mattana this is because the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, and he had therefore already completed his thirty-day term before becoming impure. Bar Padda explains that Rabbi Eliezer holds that the Sages did not decree that naziriteship should be for thirty days in such a case, but rather left intact the Torah law that he is considered to have completed his term after twenty-nine days.

HALAKHA

מי שאמר הריני נזיר – One who said: I am hereby a nazirite, shaves on the thirty-first day, and if he shaved on the thirtieth day he has fulfilled his obligation. However, if he said: I am hereby a nazirite for thirty days, he may shave only on the thirty-first day (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 4:1).

מי שצוה שתי נזירות – One who vowed to undertake two terms of naziriteship shaves for the first term on the thirty-first day, and for the second on the sixty-first day. If he shaved for the first vow on the thirtieth day, he shaves for the second term on the sixtieth day. If, after having shaved on the thirtieth day, he shaved on the fifty-ninth day, he has fulfilled his obligation (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 4:2).

נטמא יום – Became ritually impure on the thirtieth day – **שלשים:** Even if a nazirite became ritually impure on the final day of his term, his entire tally is negated. He must bring the offerings of impurity and start counting his naziriteship anew, in accordance with the unattributed opinion in the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:3).

בטמא יום מאה ואחד וכו' – Became impure on the one hundred and first day, etc. – **נטמא יום מאה ואחד וכו':** If a nazirite became ritually impure after the final day of his term, the day on which he brings his offerings, only thirty days are negated. How should he proceed? After completing the purification process, he brings the offerings of impurity and shaves. He then observes thirty days of naziriteship in ritual purity. Then, he shaves again and brings the offerings of a regular nazirite. This is in accordance with the unattributed mishna. The Rambam holds that becoming impure on the one hundred and first day voids part of the naziriteship by Torah law, and he is therefore obligated in the offerings of impurity. Conversely, *Tosafot* and the Rosh contend that it is a decree of the Sages, which means he does not bring the offerings of a ritually impure nazirite. The *Likkutei Halakhot* explains that in their opinion, he counts thirty days after his purification and brings the offerings of a regular nazirite (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:4).

NOTES

Where he said that he accepts a full thirty days – דאָמַר: The Commentary on *Nazir* and Rabbeinu Peretz explain that this is a case where one explicitly said: A full thirty days. In such a case, he certainly may not shave before the completion of all thirty days. *Tosafot* hold that he merely said: A nazirite for thirty days. The addition of the amount of days is superfluous, as an unspecified nazirite-ship is for thirty days. Therefore, the use of the additional phrase: For thirty days, is viewed as if he said a full thirty days.

Do not count as part of his tally – אין עולין לו מן המניין: The *Rid* writes that even though he is prohibited from shaving and drinking wine during this time, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan, those days do not count as part of his naziriteship term.

Offerings of impurity – קרבן טומאה: As detailed in the Torah (Numbers 6:10–12), a nazirite who becomes impure through contact with a corpse must bring three offerings after completing his purification process. They are two turtledoves, one as a sin-offering and one as a burnt-offering, and a sheep, brought as a guilt offering. These three offerings together are referred to as a *korban tuma*, the offerings of impurity.

Do count as part of his tally, etc. – עולין לו מן המניין וכו': The days of naziriteship he observed after having left the cemetery and completing his purification process are included in his term of naziriteship. According to the unattributed opinion in the mishna, this applies even if it was only a single day. If he reenters the cemetery, he will have to bring the offerings of impurity. It does not mean that the days before reentering the cemetery will count toward the final tally of his term of naziriteship, since the subsequent ritual impurity negates all days previously counted (*Tosafot*).

The Rambam has an entirely different opinion on this mishna. He holds that since the ritual impurity of the cemetery is a lower level of impurity, which does not render a nazirite obligated to bring offerings or void the tally of the days he has counted, the mishna rules that if he reenters the cemetery after starting the observance of his naziriteship, the days he has observed in ritual purity are counted toward the final tally of his term of naziriteship. The clause: And he brings the offerings of impurity, is referring to one who became impure by a corpse, which obligates him to bring the offerings. In that case, the days counted before becoming impure would be negated.

Not on the very day – לא בו ביום: The early commentaries disagree over whether two full days of ritual purity are needed (Rambam), or if his partial observance of the second day is sufficient (*Tosafot*).

קסבר רבי אליעזר: כל אחר מלאות – שבועה סותר. הריני נזיר שלשים יום ונטמא יום שלשים – סותר את הכל. לא פליג רבי אליעזר, דאמר "שלימין".

"הריני נזיר מאה יום" ונטמא יום מאה – סותר את הכל. רבי אליעזר אומר: אינו סותר אלא שלשים. וכולה כדהוינן בה אליבא דבר פדא ורב מתנא.

מתני' מי שניזר והוא בבית הקברות, אפילו היה שם שלשים יום – אין עולין לו מן המניין, ואינו מביא קרבן טומאה. יצא ונכנס – עולין לו מן המניין, ומביא קרבן טומאה.

רבי אליעזר אומר: לא בו ביום, שנאמר "והימים הראשונים יפלו" – עד שיהיו לו ימים ראשונים.

גמ' איתמר, מי שניזר והוא בבית הקברות, רבי יוחנן אמר: נזירות חלה עליו, וריש לקיש אמר: אין נזירות חלה עליו. רבי יוחנן אמר: נזירות חלה עליו, סבר: מיהלא תליא וקיימא, כיון דמשבחה טהרה – חילא וריש לקיש אמר: אין נזירות חלה עליו, אי הדר ואמר – חילא עליה, ואי לא – לא.

The Gemara explains: **Rabbi Eliezer holds that when anyone becomes ritually impure after the completion of his term of naziriteship, but before he brought his offerings, only seven days are negated, and the thirtieth day is after the completion of his term.** The mishna then teaches that one who said: **I am hereby a nazirite for thirty days, and became impure on the thirtieth day, it negates the entire tally. Rabbi Eliezer does not disagree in this case, since it is an instance where he explicitly said that he accepts naziriteship on himself for a full thirty days,**ⁿ and his ritual impurity therefore occurs during his naziriteship period.

The mishna also taught that if one said: **I am hereby a nazirite for one hundred days, and he became impure on the one hundredth day, it negates the entire tally. Rabbi Eliezer says it negates only thirty. And this entire mishna should be explained as we discussed it, in accordance with the opinions of bar Padda and Rav Mattana earlier** (5a–6b).

MISHNA One who took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery,ⁿ 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,ⁿ since his naziriteship has not yet gone into effect. And he therefore does not bring the three offerings of impurity,ⁿ 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,ⁿ those days do count as part of his tally,ⁿ 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 dayⁿ 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"ⁿ of purity, during which he observed his naziriteship.

GEMARA It was stated that the *amora'im* disagree with regard to one who vowed to be a nazirite while in a cemetery. **Rabbi Yohanan said: Naziriteship takes effect for him,**ⁿ and **Reish Lakish said: Naziriteship does not take effect for him.** The Gemara clarifies their respective opinions: **Rabbi Yohanan, who said naziriteship takes effect for him, holds that from the moment he accepts naziriteship upon himself it is pending, so that when it is found that he is in a state of ritual purity it takes immediate effect.** The vow registers from when he states it, but it cannot take effect in practice as long as he stands in a ritually impure location. **And Reish Lakish said that naziriteship does not take effect for him at all.** Consequently, if he again said after leaving the cemetery that he accepts a vow of naziriteship, it takes effect for him; but if he does not repeat his vow, he is not a nazirite.

HALAKHA

One who took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery – מי שניזר והוא בבית הקברות: If one vowed to be a nazirite while he was in a cemetery, and then stayed there for several days, this time does not count as part of the tally of his term of naziriteship. If he became ritually impure through one of the sources of ritual impurity for which a nazirite must shave and bring offerings, he does not shave or bring the offerings (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:8).

Left the cemetery and entered it again – יצא ונכנס: If one accepted naziriteship while in a cemetery and then left the cemetery, completed his purification process, and subsequently

observed several days of his naziriteship, those days he counted in ritual purity do count as part of his tally. If he then became ritually impure by an impurity that causes the negation of his previous days of naziriteship and renders him obligated to bring the offerings of impurity, his days of purity are negated and he must shave and bring the offerings of impurity, as explained by the Gemara below (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:10).

Until he will have first days – עד שיהיו לו ימים ראשונים: If a nazirite became ritually impure on the first or second day of his term of naziriteship, the tally of those days is not negated. After

completing his purification process and bringing the offerings of impurity, he continues to count from where he paused. If he became ritually impure on the third day or later, the days he observed are negated, and he must bring the offerings of impurity. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as no one disagrees with him in this matter (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:6).

Naziriteship takes effect for him – נזירות חלה עליו: If one was in a cemetery and vowed to be a nazirite, the naziriteship takes effect, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:8).

אִיתִיבִיָּה רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ: מִי שֶׁהָיָה טָמֵא וְנָזַר שְׁנֹר וְהוּא בְּבֵית הַקְּבָרוֹת, אֲפִילוּ הָיָה שָׁם שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם – אֵין עוֹלִין מִן הַמִּנְיָן, וְאֵינוֹ מְבִיא קֶרֶבֶן טוּמְאָה. קֶרֶבֶן טוּמְאָה הוּא דְלֹא מֵיָתִי, הָא מִיָּחַל חֵיילָא עֲלֵיהּ! אָמַר לֵיהּ: אֵינוֹ בְּתוֹרַת טוּמְאָה וְאֵינוֹ בְּתוֹרַת קֶרֶבֶן.

אִיתִיבִיָּה: מִי שֶׁהָיָה טָמֵא וְנָזַר – אָסוּר לְגַלַּח וְלִשְׁתּוֹת יַיִן וְלִשְׁמֹא לְמַתִּים. וְאִם גִּילַח וְשָׁתָה יַיִן וְנִטְמָא לְמַתִּים – הָרִי זֶה סוֹפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים. אִי אָמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא חֵיילָא – הֵינּוּ טַעֲמָא דְסוֹפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים, אֲלֵא אִי אָמַרְתָּ לֹא חֵיילָא – אֲמַאי סוֹפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים?

Rabbi Yoḥanan raised an objection to the opinion of Reish Lakish from the mishna: **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 the tally, since his naziriteship has not yet gone into effect. And he therefore does not bring the offerings of impurity despite having been in a cemetery.** Rabbi Yoḥanan infers from this: **It is the offerings of impurity that he does not bring, but as far as the issue of the naziriteship taking effect, it does take effect for him.** Reish Lakish said to him: It means he is not included in the law of prohibited ritual impurity, and therefore he is not included in the law of the offerings. He is not a nazirite at all.

Rabbi Yoḥanan raised an objection to the opinion of Reish Lakish from what was taught in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 2:14): **One who was impure and took a vow of naziriteship^{NH} must still observe the halakhot of a nazirite: He is prohibited from shaving, and from drinking wine, and from becoming impure from a corpse. And if he shaved, or if he drank wine, or if he became impure from a corpse, he incurs [sofeg]^L the forty lashes administered to one who actively transgresses a negative Torah prohibition.** Rabbi Yoḥanan asks: **Granted, if you say that naziriteship takes effect despite his ritual impurity, that is the reason that he incurs the forty lashes, similar to any nazirite who transgresses the prohibitions of naziriteship. But if you say the naziriteship does not take effect while he is ritually impure, why does he incur the forty lashes?**

NOTES

One who was impure and took a vow of naziriteship – מִי שֶׁהָיָה טָמֵא וְנָזַר: The early commentaries prove from here that there is no difference between one who vowed to be a nazirite while in a cemetery and one who did so while in a state of ritual impurity from a corpse, as the Gemara is attempting to bring a proof from one to the other.

HALAKHA

One who was impure and took a vow of naziriteship – מִי שֶׁהָיָה טָמֵא וְנָזַר: If one took a vow of naziriteship while he was ritually impure from a corpse, the naziriteship takes effect. Therefore, if he became impure again, drank wine, or shaved, he is liable to receive lashes (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:7).

LANGUAGE

Incurs [sofeg] – סוֹפֵג: From the Greek σπόγγος, *spongos*, meaning sponge. The word *sofeg*, from the root *shin, fey, gimmel*, meant something that absorbs liquids, and was later extended to refer to anything that can absorb something else, whether to absorb financially or, in this case, to absorb the impact of the flogging.

Perek III
Daf 17 Amud a

הַכָּא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינָן – בִּיּוֹצֵא וְנִכְנָס.

Reish Lakish responded: **With what are we dealing here in this baraita? With one who left and entered, meaning that after having left the cemetery and purifying himself, he then vowed again to be a nazirite and subsequently reentered the cemetery.**

אִיתִיבִיָּה: אֵין בֵּין טָמֵא שְׁנֹר לְנֹזֵר טְהוֹר שְׁנִטְמָא, אֲלֵא: טָמֵא שְׁנֹר – שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ עוֹלָה לֹא לְמִנְיָן, וְנֹזֵר טְהוֹר שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ עוֹלָה לֹא לְמִנְיָן. וְאִי סְלִיקָא דְעֵתָךְ לֹא חֵיילָא – אֲמַאי עוֹלָה לֹא מִן הַמִּנְיָן?

Rabbi Yoḥanan raised another objection to Reish Lakish's opinion from a different source: **The difference between a ritually impure^H person who took a vow of naziriteship and a ritually pure nazirite who became impure is only the following halakha: If a ritually impure person took a vow of naziriteship, his seventh day of purification counts as part of his tally^N of his term of naziriteship, since he starts counting his term of naziriteship as soon as he becomes pure. But with regard to a ritually pure nazirite who became impure, his seventh day of purification does not count as part of his tally.** Rather, he starts counting his days of naziriteship from the following day, which is the day on which he brings his offerings. **And if it enters your mind that a vow of naziriteship stated while ritually impure does not take effect, why does the baraita state that the seventh day counts as part of his tally, indicating that the naziriteship takes effect without a need for him to restate his vow?**

אָמַר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי: מִיָּחַל – בּוֹלֵי עֲלָמָא לֹא פְּלִיגִי דְחֵיילָא, אֲלֵא כִּי פְּלִיגִי – לְמַלְקִי, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן סָבַר: בֵּין דְּחֵיילָא – לְקִי, וְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ סָבַר: לֹא לְקִי, וְחֵיילָא.

As a result of this question, the Gemara offers a different interpretation of their dispute. **Mar bar Rav Ashi said:** The dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish is not as stated above. With regard to the question of the vow of naziriteship taking effect, **everyone agrees that it takes effect from the moment of his acceptance of naziriteship, even if he was in the cemetery. Rather, when they disagree it is with regard to being flogged,^N as follows: Rabbi Yoḥanan holds that since the vow takes effect, he is therefore flogged for becoming impure, and Reish Lakish holds that he is not flogged for becoming impure, but the vow does take effect with regard to the prohibitions of naziriteship.**

HALAKHA

The difference between a ritually impure, etc. – אֵין בֵּין טָמֵא וְנָזַר: If one took a vow of naziriteship while ritually impure, the seventh day of his purification process counts as part of the tally of his term of naziriteship. However, a ritually pure nazirite who became impure starts his counting only from the eighth day (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:7).

NOTES

His seventh day counts as part of his tally – שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ: Since he does not have to bring an offering on the eighth day, the legal status of part of the seventh day is like a that of full day, and he can therefore begin counting his naziriteship from the seventh day of his purification (Commentary on *Nazir*). Although he does not become completely ritually pure until sunset, the ritual impurity of one who has already immersed himself is weak and does not prevent his naziriteship from taking effect (*Tosafot*).

When they disagree is with regard to being flogged – כִּי פְּלִיגִי לְמִילְקִי: Most commentaries hold that the disagreement between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish is only with regard to whether a nazirite is flogged for becoming ritually impure from a corpse, and Reish Lakish agrees that a nazirite is flogged if he shaved or drank wine (*Tosafot; Rosh*). Some suggest that according to Reish Lakish the naziriteship only takes effect by rabbinic decree, and he would not be flogged for violating any of the prohibitions. However, the corresponding discussion in tractate *Nedarim* indicates that this opinion is incorrect (Rabbeinu Peretz; Rabbeinu Todros).