



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Nazir, Daf יז – Daf נ

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf יז---47-----

MISHNA

- If a nazir offered his first korbon and then became tamei, **R' Eliezer** says he loses his entire nezirus count. The **Chachomim** say he simply brings the remaining korbanos after he becomes tahor.
 - They said to **R' Eliezer**, it once happened that Miriam the Tardumis was a nezirah and she brought one of her korbanos at the end of the nezirus and then became tamei to her daughter who had passed away, and the **Chachomim** said that she need only bring the remaining korbanos after she becomes tahor!

GEMARA

- **Q:** We have learned elsewhere that **R' Eliezer** says that tumah after the nezirus count is complete only requires an additional 7 days of nezirus counting to become tahor!? **A:** Our Mishna means that **R' Eliezer** says he loses any korbanos that have been brought to that point, and does not lose any of his nezirus count. The Mishna can prove this explanation, because the **Chachomim** stated the story and said that “she need only bring the remaining korbanos”. This would suggest that they understood **R' Eliezer** to say that she lost any previously offered korbanos.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK SHLOSHA MININ!!!

PEREK KOHEN GADOL -- PEREK SHEVI'I

MISHNA

- A Kohen Gadol and a nazir may not become tamei meis even for their immediate relatives, but may become tamei for a meis mitzvah.
- If a Kohen Gadol and a nazir are travelling together and they happen upon a meis mitzvah, **R' Eliezer** says the Kohen Gadol should become tamei rather than the nazir, and the **Chachomim** say that the nazir should become tamei rather than even an ordinary Kohen. **R' Eliezer** said to them, it is preferable that the Kohen should become tamei since he does not have to bring a korbon for becoming tamei, and the nazir should not become tamei, since he must bring a korbon when he becomes tamei! The **Chachomim** said to him, it is preferable for the nazir to become tamei since his kedusha is not permanent, and the Kohen should not become tamei, because his kedusha is permanent.

GEMARA

- It is clear that when the two people being faced with the meis mitzvah are a Kohen Gadol and a nazir, there is a machlokes between **R' Eliezer and the Chachomim** as to who should become tamei.
 - If the two people walking together are a Kohen Gadol who was anointed with the shemen hamishcha and a Kohen Gadol who was appointed by putting on the special clothing, it is the latter who should become tamei, because the Kohen Gadol who was anointed with the shemen hamishcha brings a par when he does an aveirah based on his erroneous psak, whereas the other does not.
 - If the two people are a Kohen Gadol who was anointed but who is no longer the active Kohen Gadol, and an active Kohen Gadol who was not anointed with the shemen hamishcha, the former should become tamei, since he no longer does the Avodah of the Kohen Gadol.
 - If the two people are a Kohen Gadol who is currently not active in office because he is a baal keri, and a Kohen Gadol who is not active because of a mum, the latter should become tamei, because the baal keri

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

will be fit to do the Avodah tomorrow, whereas the mum will prevent doing the Avodah until it is healed.

- **Q:** If the two people are the Kohen Mashuach Milchama and the S'Gan Kohen Gadol, who should become tamei? Do we say the Mashuach Milchama has more kedusha (and should therefore not become tamei) because he is fit for battle or is the S'gan considered to be at a higher level of kedusha because he is fit to do the Avodah? **A:** A Braisa clearly says that in this case it is the Mashuach Milchama who should become tamei, and not the S'Gan.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that the Mashuach Milchama takes precedence over the S'Gan (which would suggest that the S'Gan is the one who should become tamei in our situation)!? **A: Mar Zutra** said, with regard to supporting him, the Mashuach Milchama takes precedence, since many people depend on him. However, with regard to tumah, the S'Gan is considered on a higher level since he is fit to do the Avodah of Yom Kippur, and therefore the Mashuach Milchama should become tamei.
- **Q:** The machlokes is only when deciding who between the Kohen Gadol and the nazir should become tamei to the meis mitzvah. However, all would agree that each of them alone would become tamei to a meis mitzvah. How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a Kohen Gadol says “v'ahl kol nafshos meis lo yavo, l'aviv ule'imo lo yitamah”. Now, the first part of the pasuk can't be referring to non-relatives, because if an ordinary Kohen may not become tamei to non-relatives, then a Kohen Gadol may surely not become tamei to non-relatives. Therefore, “v'ahl kol nafshos meis lo yavo” must refer to relatives. If so, why does the pasuk then specifically say that he may not become tamei “l'aviv”? This teaches that he may not become tamei to his father, but may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. The word “le'imo” is used for a gezirah shava to teach that just as a nazir may become tamei to someone who is a metzora or a zav, the same is true for a Kohen Gadol.

-----Daf פנ"ד---48-----

- **Q:** How do we know that a nazir may become tamei to a meis mitzvah? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding nazir that says “ahl nefesh meis lo yavo” teaches that he may not become tamei to a meis. The pasuk that says he may not become tamei “l'aviv ule'imo” therefore teaches that he *may* become tamei to a meis mitzvah. One would think that we could have learned this from Kohen Gadol with a kal v'chomer – if a Kohen Gadol, whose kedusha is permanent, may become tamei to a meis mitzvah, then surely a nazir, whose kedusha is not permanent, may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. However, this kal v'chomer can be refuted by saying that maybe only a Kohen Gadol can become tamei, because he does not become obligated to bring a korbon when he becomes tamei, whereas a nazir must bring a korbon. That is why the pasuk of “l'aviv...” is necessary. The Braisa asks, maybe we should say that a nazir may become tamei to other people, just not his family? The Braisa says, we can learn from a kal v'chomer that this cannot be the case. If an ordinary Kohen, who may become tamei to his relatives, may not become tamei to other people, then a nazir, who the pasuk says may not become tamei to his family, may surely not become tamei to other people. Therefore, the words of “l'aviv...” are extra and teach that he may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. The Braisa says, without the pasuk of “l'aviv” we would know that a nazir may not become tamei to his father. Regarding a nazir the pasuk says a general statement that he may not become tamei to meisim, and regarding a Kohen Gadol the pasuk does the same. Just as in regard to a Kohen Gadol he may not become tamei to his father, but may become tamei to a meis mitzvah, the same would be for a nazir. However, we would ask that maybe we should compare the nazir's general statement to that written regarding an ordinary Kohen, and thereby learn that a nazir may become tamei to his father? The pasuk therefore writes “l'aviv”, which is extra and teaches that he may not become tamei to his father, but may become tamei to a meis mitzvah.
 - **Q:** We just said the word “l'aviv” is necessary to teach that nazir should not be compared to an ordinary Kohen, so how can the Braisa then say that the word is extra!? **A:** The word “l'aviv” teaches that he may not become tamei to his close relatives, the word “le'imo” is used for the gezeira shava of **Rebbi** (that a Kohen Gadol may become tamei to a zav or a metzora, just like a nazir), the word “l'achiv” teaches that he may become tamei to a meis mitzvah, and the word “l'achoso” teaches what is taught in a Braisa, that if a person is on his way to bring his Pesach or to give his son a bris milah and hears that his relative

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

has died, he should not become tamei to them. However, even such a person would still be required to make himself tamei for the sake of burying a meis mitzvah (even though the mitzvah of Korbon Pesach and of milah carry the kares penalty).

- **R' Akiva** darshens the words of the pasuk differently. He says the word “nefashos” teaches that the nazir may not become tamei to non-relatives. The word “meis” teaches that he may not become tamei even to relatives. The words “l'aviv ule'imo” teach that he may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. The word “l'achiv” teaches that even a Kohen Gadol who is a nazir may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. The word “l'achoso” teaches what is taught by the Braisa stated immediately above.
 - **Q:** How will **R' Akiva** learn the gezeirah shava of **Rebbi**? **A:** Since he learns that a Kohen Gadol who is a nazir may become tamei to a meis mitzvah (above) he doesn't need a separate source to teach that a regular Kohen Gadol may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. If so, the word “le'imo” regarding the Kohen Gadol is extra, and can be used for the gezeirah shava.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yishmael**, who learns the words of the pasuk as darshened previously (the drasha given before **R' Akiva**), how will he learn that a Kohen Gadol who is also a nazir may become tamei to a meis mitzvah? **A:** Since the Torah said that the meis mitzvah overrides one lav (the lav of nazir or the lav of Kohen Gadol each on its own) there is no reason to say that it would not override two laavim (when he is a Kohen Gadol and a nazir).
 - **Q:** If he holds that the concept of meis mitzvah is so strong, why does he need the word of “l'achoso” to teach that a person who is going to bring his Pesach or to give a bris milah to his son must become tamei to a meis mitzvah? **A:** We would think that meis mitzvah only overrides laavim, but not something that carries the kares penalty. The pasuk therefore teaches that it overrides that as well.

-----Daf ט"ט-----49-----

- **Q: R' Akiva** learned from the word “l'achiv” written regarding a nazir that a Kohen Gadol who is a nazir may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. If so, that can also serve as the source that a regular Kohen Gadol may become tamei to a meis mitzvah. If so, what does he learn from the extra words “l'aviv ule'imo” written regarding a Kohen Gadol? **A:** These words are needed. If the pasuk would only say that he can't become tamei to his father we would say that is so because paternity is only based on a chazakah, but not absolute certainty. However, we would think that he may become tamei to his mother, who is known to be his mother with certainty. That is why we need the word “ule'imo”. If the Torah would have only written the word “imo” we would say that the Kohen Gadol can't become tamei to her, because he doesn't follow her lineage, but he could become tamei to his father, since he follows his lineage. The pasuk therefore clearly says that he may not become tamei to his father either.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Akiva** learn from the pasuk of “v'ahl kol nafshos meis lo yavo” written regarding the Kohen Gadol? **A:** He says “ahl kol” teaches that a Kohen Gadol is liable to a second lav for becoming tamei to a non-relative; “meis” teaches that he may not become tamei to relatives; “nafshos” teaches that he may not become tamei from a revi'is of blood that came from two bodies, which gives off tumah via tumas ohel.

MISHNA

- A nazir must shave his head and complete the process of a tamei nazir if he becomes tamei from one of the following sources of tumah: a meis; a kezayis of flesh from a meis; a kezayis of “netzel”; a spoonful of dust made of a decomposed meis; the spinal column and skull of a meis; the severed limb of a meis or of a live person that has enough flesh on it to regenerate itself if it were attached to a living body; a half kav of bones; a half log of blood. A nazir becomes subject to the entire tamei nazir process if he becomes tamei from these items, whether by direct contact, by carrying them, or through tumas ohel.
 - The nazir would also become subject to the process if he becomes tamei from a barley sized piece of bone, but only if touched it or carried it (i.e. not via tumas ohel).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- For all the above the nazir would be subject to the entire process and would have to be sprinkled with the parah adumah on the 3rd and 7th day after becoming tamei. He would also lose any days of nezirus previously counted. He would not begin his counting his nezirus until he is tahor and brings his korbanos that he must bring for this process (a chatas, an olah, and an asham).

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, after **R' Meir** passed away, **R' Yehuda** prohibited the students of **R' Meir** from entering the Beis Medrash, because he said "They are not coming to learn, but are rather coming to harass me" and to show that **R' Meir's** way of learning was sharper. **Sumchos** fought his way in to the Beis Medrash. They were learning our Mishna and **Sumchos** said, "**R' Meir** taught our Mishna as saying that a nazir becomes tamei from a meis, and from a kezayis of a meis..." (as we have in our reading of the Mishna). **R' Yehuda** (who didn't have the reading to include "for a meis") became angry and said, this is why I told you to keep them out of here. They are only coming to harass me. If he becomes tamei from a kezayis of a meis, then it is obvious that he becomes tamei from a meis as well!? **R' Yose** was present and knew that **R' Meir's** version of the Mishna was correct. He said, I can't remain quiet now out of respect for **R' Yehuda**, because then the correct version of the Mishna will be lost. **R' Yose** therefore said, the words of "a meis" are needed for a case when there is less than a kezayis of flesh on the meis, and the Mishna is teaching that the nazir would become subject to the whole process even by becoming tamei from such a meis.
 - **Q:** We can still say that "a meis" is unnecessary, because if he becomes tamei and subject to the process from the severed limb of a meis (even if it has less than a kezayis of flesh) then he will certainly be subject to the process for becoming tamei to an entire meis with less than a kezayis of flesh!? **A:** We can answer like **R' Yochanan** said elsewhere, and say that the words "a meis" are needed to teach that he becomes tamei and subject to the process from a fetus whose limbs are not yet fully attached with sinews and are therefore not given the halachic status of "limbs". However, since it is a complete meis, the nazir would become tamei from it even if it has less than a kezayis of flesh. **A2: Rava** said, the words "a meis" are necessary to teach that the nazir would become subject to the process if he becomes tamei from bones consisting of a majority of the skeletal makeup of a meis or consisting of the majority of the number of bones of the meis, even if the bones add up to less than a quarter of a kav.

-----Daf 1---50-----

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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- 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 this is not a proof for 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.

-----Daf X]---51-----

- 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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.

-----Daf 52-----

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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

-----Daf 11-----53-----

- **Q:** The Gemara is trying to answer the question of whether a quarter kav of bones of the spinal column or skull (as opposed to the half kav that is needed from other bones) would require a nazir to shave his head and be treated as a nazir tamei. The Gemara says, maybe we can answer this from the Braisa just quoted, in which **Shammai** said that a single bone from the spinal column or skull creates tumas ohel. The **Rabanan** disagree, but presumably agree to the point that the spinal column and skull are more stringent with regard to tumah, and would therefore hold that even a quarter kav would require the nazir to shave his head, etc.!? **A:** It may be that **Shammai** is so much more of a stringent view, and that the **Rabanan** do argue to the point of saying that the spinal column or skull is not treated more stringently.
 - **Q:** If so, then we can answer the question by saying that the **Rabanan** hold even the bones of the spinal column or skull would have to equal a haf kav in order to require the nazir to shave his head!? **A:** It may be that the **Rabanan** agree that the spinal column or skull are treated more stringently and as such would only need a quarter kav to require a nazir to shave his head.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Eliezer** said, the Early Zikeinim would say that a half kav of bones and a half lug of blood are the measurements needed for all matters of tumas ohel, whereas a quarter kav and quarter lug are sufficient for other matters. Some of the Elders would say that a quarter kav and quarter lug are the measurements needed for everything. The later Beis Din said, half kav and half lug are required for all matters, except that a quarter kav and quarter lug are sufficient to prohibit someone from eating terumah and kodashim, but not to make a nazir shave his head or prevent someone from bringing a Korbon Pesach.
 - **Q:** Why did **Rebbi** write the Mishna like the later, third view, when it argues on the earlier two? **A: R’ Yaakov bar Idi** said, this view was said based on a tradition from Chagai, Zecharya, and Malachi.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The first time the Mishna uses the words “for these” it comes to exclude a bone the size of a barley from things requiring a nazir to shave his head based on tumas ohel alone. The words “for these” in the later part of the Mishna come to exclude the case of where there are a number of stone overhangs and a meis is under one of them, and a nazir walks under an overhang, but is not sure which overhang he walked under. The Mishna teaches that he does not shave his head based on that tumah either.

V'CHATZI KAV ATZAMOS

- The Mishna says that although the nazir would not shave for tumas ohel of a quarter kav, he would shave for touching or carrying a quarter kav.
 - **Q:** This seems to be unnecessary, because the Mishna then says that he would shave for touching or carrying even a barley sized bone!? **A:** The ruling is necessary in a case where the bones are ground into a powder. In that case there is no barley sized piece, but there can be a quarter kav amount.

AHL EIVER MIN HAMEIS V' AHL EIVER MIN HACHAI SHEYEISH ALEIHEN BASSAR KARA'UY

- **Q:** If there is not enough flesh on the limbs to regenerate, would the nazir still have to shave his head for touching and carrying these limbs? **A:** **R' Yochanan** says he would not shave for that, since our Mishna says that he must only shave when there is enough flesh on the limb and this applies to all forms of tumah (touching, carrying, or ohel), and **Reish Lakish** says that he would, since the next Mishna, which lists things for which a nazir does not shave for, does not list a limb with less than this amount of flesh.
 - **R' Yochanan** says that absence in the next Mishna is not determinate. The reason it is left out is because it is already dealt with in the earlier part of the Mishna (like **R' Yochanan** explained).
 - **Q:** The Mishna listed a half kav of bones, which suggests that a quarter kav would not require a nazir to shave via ohel, and yet the next Mishna specifically lists a quarter kav as not requiring the nazir to shave via ohel!? **A:** It had to be listed in the next Mishna to teach that although he does not shave for a quarter kav via ohel, he would have to shave for it via touching or carrying.
 - **Q:** The Mishna listed a half lug of blood, which suggests that a quarter lug would not require a nazir to shave, and yet the next Mishna specifically lists a quarter lug as not requiring the nazir to shave!? **A:** That was listed to counter the view of **R' Akiva**, who says that a nazir would shave for touching or carrying a quarter lug of blood.
 - **Q:** What is the case of the limb from the meis? If the limb has in it a barley sized bone, why does **R' Yochanan** say that the nazir need not shave based on it? If the limb does not have this bone, then why does **Reish Lakish** say that he must shave? **A:** **Reish Lakish** will say that the case is where there is no barley sized bone. Still, it gives off tumah and requires the nazir to shave his head based on a drasha of the pesukim in a Braisa, which teaches that a barley sized bone gives off tumah and separately teaches that the limb of a meis gives off tumah. It must be that the case of the limb is where it does not contain a barley sized bone, and still the Braisa learns from the pasuk that it gives off tumah. **R' Yochanan** will say that the limb has a barley sized bone inside. One pasuk teaches that it gives off tumah through touching and the other teaches that it gives off tumah through carrying. However, the limb only gives off tumah because of the bone within.