



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

Nazir Daf Nun Aleph

- A Braisa says, the meis to which the concept of “rekev” (dust of a decomposed meis, which carries tumah) applies is only a meis that was buried without clothing in a marble coffin or on a stone floor (so that the rekev is purely from the meis). However, if he was buried in clothing, or in a wooden coffin or on a floor of bricks, the halachos of rekev do not apply.
- **Ulla** said, the halachos of rekev only apply to dust that came from decayed flesh, sinews, *and* bones.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Braisa says, rekev that comes from flesh is tahor. This suggests that rekev from only bones would be tamei!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that rekev from flesh is tahor until there is also dust from bones in it as well.
 - **Q: Ulla** had said there must be dust from sinews mixed in as well!? **A:** It is impossible for there to be flesh and bones without there having been sinews there as well.
- **R' Shamen bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if there are two meisem buried together, the halachos of rekev do not apply, because each meis becomes a “foreign substance” to the other, and it is not considered to be pure dust of the meis.
 - **Q: R' Nosson the son of R' Oshaya** asked, a Braisa says that rekev that comes from 2 meisem is tamei!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa is discussing where they were buried separately, and the dust of each of them then combined to reach the minimum amount to cause tumah. However, when they are buried together, the dust does not cause tumah.
- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if one cut the hair of a meis and then buried it along with him, it is considered to be a foreign substance, and the dust will not have the halachos of rekev.
 - A Mishna says, all parts of a meis are tamei, except for the teeth, hair and nails. However, when these are still attached to the body, they are tamei.
 - **Q: Chizkiya** asked, if his hair or nails were ready to be cut, but they were not yet cut, are they considered as already cut and they therefore don't have tumah, or are they considered to be still attached and therefore are tamei?
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from **Rabbah bar bar Chana**, who said that the hair is only considered to be a foreign substance once it was cut. This suggests that when still attached it would be considered as part of the body!? **A:** This is no proof, because it may be that in the case when the hair was ready to be cut **Rabbah bar bar Chana** would have remained in doubt as to whether it is considered as part of the body or not.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, if the dust comes from the heel of the meis, is it given the halachos of rekev? Do we say that since the heel skin is dead even when the person is alive it does not constitute rekev, or do we say that it does? **A:** We can answer from the Braisa quoted above that said that rekev from two meisem is tamei. Now, if rekev of the heel is not, then we should be concerned that the rekev contains rekev of the heel (which would be a foreign substance) and is therefore not tamei!
 - This Braisa is no proof. When the entire body has decomposed, it is clear that the rekev of the heel will not prevent the rekev of the entire body from being tamei. The question is when only the limb near the heel decomposed. In that case, do we say that the rekev of the heel prevents the other rekev from being tamei? **TEIKU.**
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, if there is a fetus in the womb of a woman when she died, is that considered to be a foreign substance to the mother so that her rekev is not tamei? Do

we say that a fetus is part of the mother (like we say regarding other halachos) or do we say that since it is destined to exit the mother, it is considered to be separate from the mother? **Q:** If we say that since it will exit the mother it is considered to be separate, what is the halacha if the woman had shichvas zerah in her? Do we say that since it had not yet created an embryo it is considered as part of her, or do we say that since it came into her from outside of her body it is not considered to be part of her?

- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what is the halacha if there are wastes in the intestines of the meis? Do we say that the food was necessary for life and is therefore considered to be part of the body, or do we say that since it came from outside, it is not considered part of the body? **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** asked, what is the halacha regarding the skin of the meis (is it considered a foreign substance or not)? **R' Huna bar Manoach** asked, what is the halacha regarding the saliva and mucus of the meis?
 - **Q: R' Shmuel bar Acha** asked, if all these things are considered as foreign substances, there will never be a case of pure rekev!? **A:** The case would be where the person drank palm water (a laxative) before he died, used a cream to remove all his hair, and was then cooked in the hot springs of Teverya to remove his skin.
- **Abaye** said, we have a tradition, that a meis who was ground into dust is not considered rekev.
 - **Q:** They asked, what if after being ground the meis then decomposed? Do we say that the ground dust contained all the necessary ingredients of rekev (flesh, bones, and sinews) and it is therefore now considered to be rekev, or do we say that rekev must come from when the meis decomposes in its original state? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Ulla bar Chanina** taught a Braisa, that an incomplete meis cannot create rekev, does not have the halacha (of a complete meis) that the loose surrounding earth must be moved along with him if he is moved, and does not have the halacha of a complete meis that if 3 meisem are found buried in an area they may not be relocated.
 - **Q:** A Mishna contrasts a meis and the severed limb of a living person. The Mishna says that a meis has the halachos of rekev and a severed limb of a living person does not. The contrast would seem to be to a *limb* of a meis, and this would suggest that even a limb of a meis has the halacha of rekev!? **A:** The Mishna means that the concept of rekev applies to a meis – a complete meis – and in that way it is more stringent than a limb of a living person.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if the limb of a live person decomposed, and then the person died, what is the status of the decomposed limb? Do we say that rekev only applies when the decomposing happened after the person has died, or do we say that since the person is now dead, the halacha of rekev applies? **A:** The Mishna quoted immediately above said that rekev does not apply to a live person. This would suggest that as long as he is dead it would apply to his limb that was severed during his lifetime.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the Mishna may mean that a living person, or anything that comes from a living person, never has the halachos of rekev.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what is the halacha if an ant is missing a limb and someone ate it? Do we say that it is now missing part of the minimum measurement for malkus and he is therefore patur, or do we say that it is still considered a complete living creature and he is therefore chayuv? **A: R' Yehuda MiDiskarta** said, a Braisa says that we learn from pesukim that a sheretz must be at least the size of a lentil to give off tumah, since the smallest sheretz that we find is the size of a lentil when it comes into existence. Now, we can see from here that if it is missing a piece the person would be patur, because here we are saying that less than a lentil would never be tamei!
 - **R' Shmaya** said, this is no proof. It may be that the smallest sheretz cannot live if any of its limbs are missing, and that is why it can't give off tumah. However, an ant can live with a missing limb, and it therefore may still get the status of a full creature even when it has a missing limb!? **TEIKU.**