



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

Nazir Daf Nun Beis

HASHEDRA V'HAGULGOLES

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean that it must be the spinal column *and* the skull, or does it mean the spinal column *or* the skull? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says, if a spinal column is missing most of its ribs, it is tahor. If it is in a grave it would be tamei. This suggests that if the ribs were not missing, the spinal column alone would be tamei (even without the skull).
 - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the Braisa may be teaching that the missing ribs make it tahor. However, even with the ribs, the Braisa may be unsure about the status of the spinal column without the skull.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa in which **R' Yehuda** said that there were 6 things that **R' Akiva** said were tamei and the **Chachomim** said were tahor, and **R' Akiva** then retracted his view to that of the **Chachomim**. The Braisa says, it once happened that Tudus the doctor and other doctors went to examine a pile of bones to see where they came from and to determine whether they would create tumas ohel. The doctors determined that the bones were not from the spinal column of a single meis, and as such do not create tumas ohel. Now, this would suggest that if they were from one meis, even though the skull was not there, it would have created tumas ohel!? **A:** The Braisa may be saying, not only was it only the spinal column without the skull, but even the spinal column itself was from two different people!
 - **Q:** This Braisa lists the 6 cases where **R' Akiva** argued with the **Chachomim**. The last of the cases listed is where there is a spinal column and skull that comes from two meisem. Now, if the spinal column and skull are each metameh on their own, they should be listed as separate cases and there should be a list of 7 cases, not just 6!? **A:** It may be that these cases are counted as two separate cases. When the Braisa gives the number of "6 cases" it means to reference all the cases in which **R' Akiva** is opposed by many **Chachomim**. There is one case in the list in which he was only opposed by a single Chochom (**R' Yochanan ben Nuri**, as stated in a Braisa) – the case of a bone the size of a barley which was split in half. Although that case is listed, it is actually a 7th case, not included in the "6 cases". **A2:** We can also say that that the "6 cases" are not meant to include the case of the severed limb of live people, which is listed, but not meant to be included in the number. **A3:** We can also say that the number of "6 cases" is not meant to include the case of the barley sized bone, since that does not require a nazir to shave his head based on it though tumas ohel. **A4:** We can also say that the number of "6 cases" was only meant to include the cases where **R' Akiva** retracted his view, and he did not retract his view in the case of a reviis of blood that comes from 2 people. Therefore, although that case is listed, it was not included in the number of "6 cases".
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa brings a machlokes in which **Shammai** holds that a single bone from the spinal column or skull can create tumas ohel!? **A:** We can't bring a proof from **Shammai**, because he was very machmir.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that we see the **Rabanan** argue on **Shammai** (who was very machmir) and they hold that a full spinal column *and* skull is needed to create tumas ohel!? **A:** It may be that they argue and hold that a single bone would not be enough, but they may very well hold that a full spinal column on its own or a full skull on its own would create tumas ohel.

- **Q:** Although a quarter kav of bones creates tumas ohel, a nazir would not have to shave his head and go through the process of a nazir tamei unless he became tamei to a half kav of bones. **Rami bar Chama** asked, is this even true for bones of the spinal column and skull, or do we say that since they are more stringent, even a quarter kav of them would require the nazir to shave his head? **A: Rava** said, if it is true that even a quarter kav of those bones would require the nazir to shave his head, then the Mishna should not have listed “the spinal column and skull” as requiring the nazir to shave his head. Rather, it should have said a quarter kav of bones from the spinal column and skull require the shaving, and we would then surely know that he would need to do so for tumah from the full spinal column and skull!
 - **Q:** We find that **Rava** himself said that the Mishna is referring to a spinal column and skull that in its entirety is less than a quarter kav of bones, so the Mishna’s choice of words is no proof!? **A:** He made this statement only after he heard from **R’ Akiva** that a spinal column and skull can be so small as to not even contain a quarter kav of bones. Initially he did not realize that.