



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

Nazir Daf Chuf Daled

MISHNA

- If a woman makes a neder of nezirus and designates animals for her korbanos that she must bring at the conclusion of her nezirus, and her husband is then meifer her neder, if the animals belonged to him, they lose all their kedusha. If the animals belonged to her, the chatas must be left to die, the olah is brought as a voluntary olah, and the shelamim is brought as a voluntary shelamim. The shelamim is treated like the shelamim of a nazir in that it may only be eaten for one day, but it is unlike the shelamim of a nazir in that she does not need to bring the various breads with the shelamim that are typically brought along with the shelamim of a nazir.
 - If she had set aside money to buy korbanos and the money was unspecified (as to specifically which korbon the various coins were), the money is used for voluntary olos tzibbur. If the money was specified as to which korbon, then the money for the chatas must be thrown into the Yam Hamelach and it is assur to benefit from, but is not subject to me'ilah. The money for the olah should be used to bring an olah, and it is subject to me'ilah. The money for the shelamim should be used to bring a voluntary shelamim, and this shelamim may be eaten for only one day, but does not require the various breads typically brought with the shelamim of a nazir.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Gemara assumes that a husband is not obligated to give animals for his wife's korbanos obligations, which is why if he gives her animals the Mishna still refers to them as being "his". The Gemara therefore asks, who is the Tanna of our Mishna who holds that a husband is not obligated to give animals for his wife's obligation? **A: R' Chisda** said it is the shita of the **Rabanan**, because we find in a Braisa that **R' Yehuda** clearly says that a husband must provide for his wife's korbanos obligations. **Rava** said, the Mishna can even follow **R' Yehuda**, because even he would hold that he is only obligated to give her animals for a korbon that she ultimately must bring. In this case, since he was meifer, she no longer must bring the korbon. Therefore, the animal goes back to him and is considered to be "his".
 - **Others** say that **R' Chisda** said the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, because he holds that a husband is only obligated to give her animals for a korbon that she ultimately must bring. In this case, since he was meifer, she no longer must bring the korbon. Therefore, the animal goes back to him and is considered to be "his". However, according to the **Rabanan** he need not supply her with any animals for her obligations. So, the only reason he would give her animals is if he voluntarily decided to do so. If he did so, they would no longer be considered "his". **Rava** said the Mishna may even follow the **Rabanan**, because when he voluntarily decides to give her animals for her korbanos he does so only for korbanos that she ultimately must bring. In this case, since he was meifer, she no longer must bring the korbon. Therefore, the animal goes back to him and is considered to be "his".

IHM SHELAH HUYSAH B'HEMTA CHATAS TAMUS V'OLAH TIKRAV

- **Q:** The rule is that a husband owns anything that is acquired by his wife. If so, how can she have her own animals? **A: R' Pappa** said, we are talking about animals that were bought with the money she is given to buy herself food. That money becomes totally hers and the animals are therefore considered to be totally hers as well. **A2:** The animals were given to her by someone else on the condition that her husband has no rights to them. In that case as well, the animals would belong exclusively to her.

HA'OLAH TIKRAV OLAH V'HASHLAMIM TIKRAV...

- **Shmuel** asked **Avuha bar Ihi** to tell him all cases of a nazir's shelamim that are brought without the breads. He answered the cases are: 1) his, 2) hers, 3) after death, and 4) after kaparah.
 - The case of "hers" is the case of our Mishna.
 - The case of "his" is where a person declares his son to be a nazir and the son or relatives protest to the declaration. If the father had designated money for a shelamim, the money is used to bring a shelamim that is brought without breads.
 - The case of "after death" is stated in a Mishna which says that a nazir who dies before bringing his korbanos and he had designated money for the korbanos, the money designated for the shelamim is to be used to bring a shelamim that is brought without the breads.
 - The case of "after kaparah" (where the owner used a different animal and has already gotten his kaparah) is based on the logic that this is the same as a shelamim whose owner has died – the animals in both cases are no longer fit for a kaparah. Therefore, they are used for a shelamim that is brought without breads.
 - **Q:** There is another case of such a shelamim – namely the case where the shelamim of a nazir was brought in an improper way (e.g. with the wrong intention or at the wrong age), in which case the halacha is that it does not suffice for his obligation, but it is brought without the accompanying breads!? **A:** The list was only meant to include cases in which the procedures were properly followed.