



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Nazir Daf Nun

AHL KEZAYIS MEIS V' AHL KEZAYIS NETZEL

- **Q:** What is netzel? **A:** It is decomposed flesh that congealed and fluids of the meis that bubble when heated.
 - **Q:** What is the case that it is necessary to know that the congealed substance is tamei as netzel? If we don't know that the substance came from the meis, then even if it congeals, why do we say that that proves it must be from the meis? If we know that it came from the meis, then it should give off tumah even if it did not congeal!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, the case is where there is a liquid that came from the meis, but we don't know if it is mucus (which does not give off tumah) or decomposed flesh (which does give off tumah). Therefore, if it congeals, it means it is decomposed flesh. If not, it is mucus.
- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, is there the concept of netzel by an animal (would it give off tumas neveilah)? Do we say that there is only a tradition regarding netzel when it comes from a person, or do we say that it even applies to that of an animal? According to the view that an animal carcass no longer gives off tumas neveilah once it is not fit to be eaten by people, then it would be clear that netzel of an animal would not give off tumas neveilah. However, according to the view that it continues to give off tumas neveilah for as long as it is fit to be eaten by a dog, would netzel of an animal give off tumah? **A:** A Braisa says that fats of a neveilah bird that are melted over a fire remain tamei (they remain fit for human consumption). If they were melted in the sun they are tahor. Now, when they melt in the sun they are fit to be eaten by a dog and yet we say it is not tamei in this state. This must be because it is netzel at that point, and there is no concept of netzel for an animal.
 - The Gemara says, it may be that it becomes tahor then only because melting in the sun spoils the fats to the point that it is no longer fit to be eaten by a dog either. However, animal netzel which would be eaten by a dog may transmit tumah.
- A Mishna said, when a liquid is poured from a tahor keili to a tamei keili, the stream in mid-air and the liquid in the upper keili remain tahor until they are in the lower keili (the stream of liquid is not considered to connect the two), except in the case of Zifim honey and "tzapichis". **B"S** say, also a thick cereal of "grisin" or of "pol" are considered to connect the substances in both keilim, because when one stops pouring these items the streams jump back into the upper keili.
 - **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, according to the **T"K** is a stream of melted foods (e.g. fats) considered to connect the two keilim when it is being poured from one to the other or not? Does the **T"K** hold that honey and tzapichis streams jump back up when the pouring stops and that is why they are considered to be connected, and melted foods don't do that, so they are not considered to be connected, or does he hold that they are connected because they are thick and since melted foods are also thick they are also considered to be connected? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says, if there is a kezayis sized piece of fats from a meis and one then melts it, it remains tamei. Now, if we say that melted foods are not considered to be connected, then since during the melting process some of the fats melted off before the rest, it should not be considered connected and should therefore be considered as less than a kezayis and not be tamei!? **R' Zeira and Ravina** responded, that the case is where the entire kezayis never separated from each other at all, and therefore there is no proof to our question.
 - **Q: Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, maybe we can answer this from **B"S**, who clearly say that it is because the cereal jumps back to the upper keili. This must be the

reason of the **T"K** as well!? **A:** This is no proof. It may be that the **T"K's** reason is based on the thickness and **B"S's** reason is based on the stream jumping back.

V' AHL MELO TARVAD REKEV

- **Q:** How much is a spoonful? **A: Chizkiya** said, it is a palmful without the fingers, and **R' Yochanan** said, it is a handful (palmful with the fingers).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says that a spoonful is the amount from the base of the fingers to the fingertips. The **Chachomim** say it is a handful. Now, **R' Yochanan** can follow the **Rabanan**, but **Chizkiya** seems to follow neither view in the Braisa!? **A:** They answered, the size of a palmful and that of the base of the fingers to the fingertips is one and the same. **A2: R' Simi bar Ada** said to **R' Pappa**, it may be that **R' Meir** means to give the measurement of the base of the fingers to the wrist, which would be the exact same thing as saying a palmful.