

אִיתִיבִיָּה רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ: מִי שֶׁנָּזַר וְהָיָה בְּבֵית הַקְּבָרוֹת, אִפְּלוּ הָיָה שָׁם שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם – אֵין עוֹלִין מִן הַמִּנְיָן, וְאֵינוּ מְבִיאִים קֶרֶבֶן טוּמְאָה. קֶרֶבֶן טוּמְאָה הוּא דְלֹא מֵיִתִּי, הָא מִיִּחַל חֵיִלָּא עֲלֵיהּ! אָמַר לֵיהּ: אֵינוּ בְּתוֹרַת טוּמְאָה וְאֵינוּ 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 חֵיִלָּא – הֵיִינוּ טַעֲמָא דְסוֹפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים, אֲלֵא אִי אָמַרְתָּ לֹא חֵיִלָּא – 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?**

Perek III
Daf 17 Amud a

הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינָן – בִּיּוֹצֵא וְנִכְנָס.

אִיתִיבִיָּה: אֵין בֵּין טָמֵא שֶׁנָּזַר לְנִזְרוּת טָהוֹר שֶׁנִּטְמָא, אֲלֵא: טָמֵא שֶׁנָּזַר – שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ עוֹלָה לֹא לְמִנְיָן, וְנִזְרוּת טָהוֹר שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ עוֹלָה לֹא לְמִנְיָן. וְאִי סָלְקָא דְעַתְדָּן לֹא חֵיִלָּא – אֲמַאי עוֹלָה לֹא מִן הַמִּנְיָן?

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.**

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?**

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.**

אָמַר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי: מִיִּחַל – בּוֹלֵי עֲלָמָא לֹא פְּלִיגִי דְחֵיִלָּא, אֲלֵא כִּי פְּלִיגִי – לְמַלְקִי, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן סָבַר: בֵּין דְּחֵיִלָּא – לָקִי, וְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ סָבַר: לֹא לָקִי, וְחֵיִלָּא.

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.

HALAKHA

The difference between a ritually impure, etc. – אֵין בֵּין טָמֵא וְכִּי נָזַר: 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 it is with regard to being flogged – כִּי נָזַר וְחֵיִלָּא: 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).

With regard to shaving, this and that are equal – לתגלחת – זה וזה שוין: The Commentary on *Nazir* understands this to be saying that just as a nazirite who became ritually impure must shave his hair on the seventh day of his purification process, so too one who took a vow of naziriteship while ritually impure must shave on the seventh day of his purification process before reaccepting his naziriteship. Although the Gemara later proves that this is not so, the Gemara here is not concerned with that proof, since this explanation of Reish Lakish is entirely discounted anyway (*Tosafot*).

Alternatively, this means that is they are both liable to receive lashes if they shave during their days of ritual impurity. *Tosafot* question this explanation because then the *baraita* should have mentioned that they are equal with regard to being flogged for drinking wine as well. The Rosh answers that shaving is merely an example of a nazirite prohibition, and the *baraita* means that they are equal with regard to being subject to being flogged for drinking wine as well.

Speaking of his remedy, etc. – בתקנתיה קא מיידי וכו' – The *baraita* is discussing the conditions that will enable his naziriteship to take effect, rather than the transgressions that render the nazirite liable to receive lashes (Commentary on *Nazir*). *Tosafot* explain that the phrase: His remedy, is referring to one who became ritually impure unwittingly, whereas the phrase: Detrimental to him, is referring to one who became ritually impure purposefully, and is therefore liable to receive lashes. The Rosh states that this *baraita* does not discuss transgressions, but rather the fulfillment of the mitzvot of naziriteship in their proper manner.

A conclusive refutation – תיובתא – The Gemara cannot answer, as it did before, that the *baraita* is discussing one who left the cemetery and reentered, because this *baraita* mentions both ritual impurity and shaving, and according to Mar bar Rav Ashi, even Reish Lakish agrees that one who shaved or drank wine before leaving the cemetery is flogged (*Tosafot*).

Is it necessary that his exit be delayed to be liable to receive lashes – בעי שהייה למלקות – The Gemara is suggesting that one who becomes a nazirite while in a cemetery will be flogged only if he stays in place for as long as it takes to prostrate oneself, as is the *halakha* with regard to one who became ritually impure while in the Temple. The Meiri theorizes that the time requirement discussed in this case may differ from that of impurity in the Temple. *Tosafot* similarly suggest that the relevant period of time here may be the time it takes to leave and reenter the cemetery (*Shevuot* 17a). The reason for the comparison between the two cases is that in both situations contracting impurity occurs after one has entered a state or place of purity, either by vowing to be a nazirite or by physically entering the Temple, as will become clear from the conclusion of the Gemara here. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the nazirite should also be granted sufficient time to leave the cemetery before he is liable to receive lashes.

איתגביה רבי יוחנן לריש לקיש: מי שגזר והוא בבית הקברות, אפילו היה שם שלשים יום – אין עולין לו מן המנון, ואינו מביא קרבן טומאה. קרבן טומאה הוא דלא מיימי, הא מילקי לקי עליה!

בדין הוא דליתני "אינו לוקה". אלא משום דקא בעי למיתנא סיפא "יצא ונכנס עולה לו מן המנון, ומביא קרבן טומאה" – תנא רישא "אינו מביא קרבן טומאה".

תא שמע: אין בין טמא שגזר לנזיר טהור שנטמא, אלא שטמא שגזר – שביעי שלו עולה לו מן המנון, ונזיר טהור שנטמא – אין שביעי שלו עולה לו מן המנון. הא למלקות – זה וזה שוין! אמר ליה: לא, לתגלחת זה וזה שוין.

אבל לענין מלקות מאי – זה לוקה וזה אינו לוקה? ליתנייה! בתקנתיה קא מיידי, בקלקוליה לא קא מיידי.

תא שמע: מי שהיה טמא ונזר – אסור לגלח ולשתות יין, ואם גילח ושתה יין ונטמא למתים – הרי זה סופג את הארבעים! תיובתא.

בעי רבא: נזיר והוא בבית הקברות, מהו? בעי שהייה למלקות או לא?

According to this version of the dispute as well, Rabbi Yoḥanan raised an objection to Reish Lakish from the mishna, which states: **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 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 he is flogged for contracting impurity, which is not in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish.**

The Gemara answers: This inference is not correct, as **by right the mishna should teach: He is not flogged, but due to the fact that the tanna wants to teach the latter clause of the mishna, which states: 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, the tanna therefore taught a similar phrasing in the first clause of the mishna: He does not bring the offerings of impurity, so this should not be seen as an indication that he is not flogged.**

The Gemara suggests another proof in support of Rabbi Yoḥanan's opinion. **Come and hear a proof from another baraita: The difference between an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship and a pure nazirite who became impure is only the following halakha: That in the case of an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship, his seventh day of purification counts as part of his tally of the term of naziriteship. But in the case of a pure nazirite who became impure, his seventh day of purification does not count as part of his tally.** The Gemara infers: **But with regard to flogging, this nazirite and that nazirite are equal.** Reish Lakish said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: This is **not** a correct inference; rather, it is with regard to **shaving** on the seventh day of purification that **this nazirite and that nazirite are equal,**^N since even a ritually impure person who took a vow of naziriteship must shave on that day.

The Gemara asks: **But in that case, according to Reish Lakish, what is the halakha with regard to flogging? This nazirite is flogged, and that nazirite, who was ritually impure when he vowed, is not flogged?** If so, let him teach this difference as well; why does the *baraita* state that there is only one difference between them? The Gemara answers: This *baraita* is **speaking of his remedy;**^N **it is not speaking of a matter that is detrimental to him.** Consequently the *baraita* does not discuss a nazirite's punishments and discusses only the means by which he can resume his observance of naziriteship.

The Gemara further suggests: **Come and hear a proof from that which is taught in a baraita (Tosefta 2:14): One who was ritually impure and took a vow of naziriteship must still observe the halakhot of a nazirite. He is prohibited from shaving and from drinking wine. And if he shaved, or if he drank wine, or if he became ritually impure from a corpse, he incurs the forty lashes administered to one who actively transgresses a negative Torah prohibition.** The Gemara concludes: This is a **conclusive refutation**^N of the opinion of Reish Lakish, as explained by Mar bar Rav Ashi.

¶ After concluding that one who takes a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery is liable to receive lashes, Rava asks: **What is the halakha if one took a vow to be a nazirite while standing in a cemetery: Is it necessary that his exit from the cemetery be delayed for a specific period of time for him to become liable to receive lashes,**^N just as one who becomes ritually impure while in the Temple is receives lashes only if he remains there for a specific period of time, **or is it not necessary?**

היכי דמי? אילימא דאמרי ליה "לא תינזור" – למה לי שהייה נזיר מאי טעמא לא בעי שהייה – דקא מתרי ביה, הקא נמי – קא מתרי ביה!

The Gemara clarifies: **What are the circumstances** in which this question is relevant? **If we say that they said to him** in warning: **Do not take a vow of naziriteship** in the cemetery, and he ignored their warning and took a vow of naziriteship, **why do I need him to delay his exit? What is the reason** that one who was already a nazirite when he entered a cemetery **does not need to delay** his exit in order to be liable to receive lashes? **Because they warn him** not to enter, and if he enters he has transgressed a prohibition and is flogged. **Here too, they warn him** not to take the vow, and he should therefore be liable to receive lashes if he does take the vow.

Perek III
Daf 17 Amud b

אלא כגון שנכנס בשדה תיבה ומגדל, ובא חבירו ופרע מעליו מעזיבה.

Rather, Rava's question should be understood to refer to a case where one entered the cemetery in a chest, box, or cabinet,^B i.e., in large wooden containers that do not contract ritual impurity. One can enter a cemetery in such a container without becoming impure. If one was carried into a cemetery inside one of these containers, then took a vow of naziriteship, and another came and removed^N the top [*ma'aziva*]^L from above him,^{NH} he would become ritually impure by virtue of being in the cemetery.

כי גמירין שהייה – בבית המקדש, אבל אבראי – לא, או דלמא לא שניא? תיקו.

If he was then warned to leave the cemetery, the question is as follows: **When we learned^H** by tradition that one is liable to receive lashes for **delaying** his exit, does that apply only **to the Temple, but outside** the Temple, such as when a nazirite is in a cemetery, does the *halakha* **not** apply, so that he is liable to receive lashes even if he did not delay his exit? **Or perhaps it is not different**, and a nazirite in a cemetery is flogged only if he remains there for a specific period of time. The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

בעי רב אשי: נזיר והוא בבית הקברות, טעון גילוח או לא? כי בעי תגלחת – טהור שנטמא, דקא מטמא לניירותיה, אבל טמא שניזיר – לא, או דלמא לא שניא?

S Rav Ashi raises a dilemma: If one took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery, is he required to shave upon becoming ritually pure, before starting his term of naziriteship, or not? The Gemara explains the two sides of the question: **When** a ritually impure nazirite is required to shave before starting his tally, does that refer only to a ritually pure nazirite who became impure, who has defiled his naziriteship? **But a ritually impure person who only took a vow of naziriteship**, and whose naziriteship has not yet begun, is he **not** obligated to shave? **Or perhaps it is not different.**

תא שמע: מי שניזיר והוא בבית הקברות, אפילו היה שם שלשים יום – אינו עולה לו מן המנין, ואינו מביא קרבן טומאה. קרבן טומאה הוא דלא מיייתי, אבל גלוחי – בעי מה טעם קאמר: מה טעם אינו מביא קרבן טומאה – משום דלא בעי גלוחי.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear** a proof 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 his tally, since his naziriteship has not yet gone into effect, and he therefore **does not bring the offerings of impurity.** The Gemara infers from this: **It is the offerings of impurity that he does not bring, but he is required to shave.** The Gemara rejects this proof: It is possible that the mishna is saying: **What is the reason**, as follows: **What is the reason that he does not bring the offerings of impurity? Because he does not require shaving.** This indicates that the naziriteship has not yet begun, therefore, he does not bring the offerings either.

BACKGROUND

שידה – *shidda*], box [*teiva*], or cabinet [*migdal*] – **תיבה ומגדל**: The difference between these terms is not clarified by the early commentaries. Based on the few sources that do explain them, it seems that the *teiva* was a simple box with a covering or a door on the top. The *shidda*, however, was more complex, with several drawers. The *migdal*, apparently similar to what is now called a cabinet, was a box whose height was greater than its width with doors on its front.

NOTES

And another came and removed – יבא חבירו ופרע: This deals only with one who became ritually impure forcibly, through the actions of another. If the nazirite removed the cover himself, or asked another to do so, and was warned against it, he is certainly liable to receive lashes even if he does not delay his exit from the cemetery (*Tosafot*).

Removed the top [*ma'aziva*] from above him – ופרע מעליו מעזיבה: Many question the precise scenario described in the Gemara, as being in an uncovered box inside a cemetery does not cause one to become ritually impure. Therefore, some commentaries explain that the word *ma'aziva* is referring to opening the bottom of the box, which causes the ritual impurity of the cemetery to penetrate from below (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar; Rosh). Others explain that the cover was removed when both he and the box were inside an enclosure together with a corpse, which would render him ritually impure. However, some commentaries maintain that it means he removed the cover from a grave while the box was within a handbreadth of it, rendering the occupant of the box ritually impure (see *Nusha'ot HaRivan* and *Rashash*).

LANGUAGE

Top [*ma'aziva*] – מעזיבה: The word *ma'aziva* usually refers to the portion of material in the roof used to seal the holes in the roofing and to seal the room against rain. In the days of the Talmud, the *ma'aziva* was made of a combination of fine reeds and mud.

With regard to the source of the word, some contend that its meaning is connected to fixing and assistance. Here the meaning was expanded to include an upper covering for other objects as well.

HALAKHA

Removed the top from above him – ופרע מעליו מעזיבה: If a nazirite entered a cemetery in a chest, box, or cabinet, and another came and removed the top so that the nazirite became ritually impure, he is not liable to receive lashes even if he delays his exit from the cemetery. The Ra'avad disagrees, and holds that the Gemara's dilemma only concerns the issue of whether or not he must delay his exit in order to be liable to receive lashes,

and one who does delay his exit is certainly flogged. The Radbaz suggests that when the Rambam rules that he is not flogged, he is referring to a case where the nazirite was not warned (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:9; see 5:18).

When we learned, etc. – כי גמירין וכי: If a nazirite unwittingly entered a cemetery or a room with a corpse, and after realizing

where he was, he was warned that he was in violation of a Torah prohibition by remaining there, if he remains in the place he is liable to receive lashes. This applies only if he delayed his exit long enough to prostrate himself, similar to the *halakha* of a person who becomes ritually impure in the Temple (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:19).

His days of confirmed leprosy, etc. – ימי חלוטו וכו' – If a nazirite became a confirmed leper, none of his days as a leper, nor the seven days he must count after his purification, are included in his term of naziriteship. However, the period when he is quarantined in order to determine if he is a leper does count toward his term (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 7:9).

NOTES

With regard to his days of confirmed leprosy, which do not negate the previous days – בימי חלוטו שאינו מבטל את – תקודמין: The Gemara is referring to one who undertook a lengthy term of naziriteship. He continues to count the remaining days of his term even after having shaved due to his leprosy (Commentary on *Nazir*). If it was a regular term of naziriteship, he would be required to remain a nazirite for long enough to complete thirty days of hair growth after shaving. The early commentaries note that the *halakha* that his days of confirmed leprosy do not negate his previous days of naziriteship, which is stated as obvious here, is derived by the Gemara below (44a) from a verse, which teaches that only the ritual impurity imparted by a corpse negates his previous days; no other kind of ritual impurity does so (*Tosafot*).

Just as a nazirite who was in the grave – ימה נזיר בקבר – The reason why the Gemara tries to derive the *halakha* from the unusual case of one who takes a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery is because in a regular case of a ritually impure nazirite, his shaving serves to negate the previous days and therefore it cannot be a source for the *halakha* of a nazirite who became a confirmed leper. By contrast, the shaving of a nazirite who took his vow in a cemetery enables him to observe his naziriteship in ritual purity, and still his days before becoming purified do not count as part of his tally. This can serve as a source to teach that his days as a leper, in which the shaving that he does is not related to his naziriteship, should likewise not be counted as part of his term of naziriteship (Rabbeinu Peretz).

תא שמע: אין בין טמא שָׁנַר לְנוֹיֵר טָהוֹר שְׁנֵטְמָא אֱלָא: טָמָא שְׁנַר – שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ עוֹלָה לֹא מִן הַמִּנְיָן, וְנוֹיֵר טָהוֹר שְׁנֵטְמָא – אֵין שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ עוֹלָה לֹא מִן הַמִּנְיָן. מֵאֵי לָא, הָא לְתַגְלַחַת – זֶה וְזֶה שְׁוִין? לָא, הָא לְמִלְקוֹת זֶה וְזֶה שְׁוִין.

אָבַל תַּגְלַחַת מֵאֵי – זֶה מְגִלַּת, וְזֶה אֵינוֹ מְגִלַּח? לִיתֵינִיהּ. תַּנָּא שְׁבִיעֵי שְׁלוֹ, וְכָל מֵלֵי.

תא שמע: אין לי אלא ימי טומאתו שאין עולין לו מן המנין, ימי חלוטו מנין? ודין הוא: מה ימי טומאתו מגלח ומביא קרבן – אף ימי חלוטו מגלח ומביא קרבן, ומה ימי טומאתו אין עולין לו מן המנין – אף ימי חלוטו אין עולין לו מן המנין!

לא, אם אמרת בימי טומאתו – שכן מבטל בהן את הקודמין, לפיכך אין עולין לו מן המנין, תאמר בימי חלוטו שאינו מבטל את הקודמין, לפיכך עולין לו מן המנין.

אמרת: ומה נזיר בקבר, ששעריו ראוי לתגלחת – אין עולין לו מן המנין, ימי חלוטו שאין ראוי לתגלחת – לא כל שכן שאין עולין לו מן המנין?

מאי לאו תגלחת טומאה? לא, תגלחת טהרה. הכי נמי מסתברא.

The Gemara suggests another proof. **Come and hear** a proof from another *baraita*: **The difference between a ritually impure person who took a vow of naziriteship and a ritually pure nazirite who became impure is only the following halakha:** With regard to an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship, his seventh day of purification counts as part of his tally of the term of naziriteship, but with regard to a pure nazirite who became impure, his seventh day of purification does not count as part of his tally. The Gemara infers: **What, is it not so that with regard to shaving, this and that are equal, and he must shave in either case?** The Gemara rejects this: **No, there is a different inference: It is with regard to flogging that this and that are equal, but one who took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery does not have to shave.**

The Gemara questions this answer: **But what is the halakha concerning shaving? Does this one, who became ritually impure, shave, and that one, who vowed while in a cemetery, not shave? If so, let him teach this difference as well.** The Gemara answers: **The tanna taught: His seventh day, and all matters relevant to it, including the halakha of shaving.** Once it says that the seventh day is part of the tally of the ritually impure nazirite who became pure, it can be inferred that he does not bring the offerings of impurity on the eighth day, and therefore he does not shave on the seventh day.

The Gemara further suggests: **Come and hear** a proof from the following *baraita*: **I have derived only that a nazirite's days of ritual impurity do not count as part of his tally; from where do I derive that his days of confirmed leprosy,^h in a case where a nazirite became a leper during his term, do not count toward his tally of naziriteship? And it would seem that by right it should be so: Just as at the end of his days of ritual impurity the nazirite shaves and brings offerings, so too at the end of his days of confirmed leprosy the halakha is that he shaves and brings offerings for his leprosy. And this comparison can be extended: Just as the days of his ritual impurity do not count as part of his tally, so too his days of confirmed leprosy do not count as part of his tally.**

The *baraita* continues: **No, if you say so with regard to his days of ritual impurity, in that case it is because with them, the previous days of his naziriteship observed in ritual purity are negated. Therefore, those days do not count as part of his tally.** But will you say the same with regard to his days of confirmed leprosy, which do not negate the previous days?ⁿ If thirty days, enough time for his hair to regrow, remain in his term of naziriteship after becoming purified from his leprosy, the days before he contracted leprosy are not negated. It is therefore possible to argue that they do count as part of his tally.

The *baraita* continues: **But you can say that just as with regard to a nazirite who was in the grave,ⁿ i.e., a cemetery, whose hair is fit for shaving, those days spent in the cemetery do not count as part of his tally, his days of confirmed leprosy, which are not fit for counting as part of the tally required for the shaving, since he must first shave as part of the purification process for his leprosy, is it not all the more so that they do not count as part of his tally?** This concludes the *baraita*.

The Gemara now attempts to prove from the *baraita* that one who took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery must shave at the close of his process of purification: **What, is it not so that when the baraita mentions shaving, it is referring to the shaving of impurity, and it is teaching that one who took a vow of naziriteship in a cemetery must shave at the end of his purification process?** The Gemara rejects this: **No, it is referring to the shaving of purity, meaning the shaving done after one completes his term of naziriteship.** He then will shave all of his hair, including that which grew during the time he was ritually impure due to his presence in the cemetery. The Gemara adds: **So, too, it is reasonable to say that this is the correct interpretation,**