



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

### Nazir Daf Chuf Tes

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that a man may make his son a nazir but a woman may not? **A: R' Yochanan** said, it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina in the name of Reish Lakish** said, it is because a father must train his son to do mitzvos, and this is considered training to do nezirus.
  - **Q:** If it is so that the son should be trained, the mother should be able to do so as well, because a mother also trains her children!? **A:** He holds that only a father is obligated to be mechanech his children, and a mother is not.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why a son may be made a nazir but a daughter may not (this is all the Halacha allowed). However, according to **Reish Lakish**, why can't a father make a daughter into a nezira as well? **A:** He holds that a father is only obligated to be mechanech his son, and not his daughter.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why a father may only make his son a nazir, but may not subject him to other nedarim (this is all the Halacha allowed). However, according to **Reish Lakish**, why can't a father subject his son to other nedarim to be mechanech him as well? **A:** The Mishna would allow that as well. The Mishna is saying, not only may he make him subject to other nedarim, which don't deprive the child, but he may even subject him to nezirus, which deprives him of wine as well.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why the son or the family may protest the father's designation (this is what the Halacha allowed). However, according to **Reish Lakish**, why can they protest? Can they protest a father trying to teach his son to do mitzvos!? **A:** This can be an embarrassing form of chinuch for the child, and the **Rabanan** therefore gave the child the right to protest.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why a son may shave his head at the end of the nezirus even though he will be oiver the lav of "lo sakifu" (this is what the Halacha allowed). However, according to **Reish Lakish**, how can he be oiver the D'Oraisa? **A:** He holds that shaving the entire head is only an issur D'Rabanan. We therefore say that the mitzvah of chinuch which is D'Rabanan trumps the D'Rabanan of shaving the entire head.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why a son may bring a korbon at the conclusion of the nezirus (this is what the Halacha allowed). However, according to **Reish Lakish** how can he bring a korbon when he is not truly obligated? **A:** He holds that shechting chullin in the Azarah is only assur D'Rabanan, and the D'Rabanan of chinuch trumps it.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why a son may bring the korbanos if he becomes tamei and the Kohen may eat the bird which was killed with melika (as opposed to shechita). However, according to **Reish Lakish** how can he eat a bird that was not properly shechted? **A:** He holds like **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** who says that D'Oraisa a bird need not be shechted before eating, and that bringing chullin into the Azarah is only assur D'Rabanan.
    - **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** holds that way? In a Braisa **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says that the reason the bird chatas of a woman that is brought for a safek is not eaten is because doing so possibly involves two issurim – presumably the two issurim are the bringing of chullin to the Azarah, and the eating of a bird that was not properly shechted. We see that he holds these are D'Oraisa!? **A: R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, it may be that it is assur to

eat it, because doing so looks like he is being over 2 D'Rabanan issurim, which is why the **Rabanan** said it should not be eaten.

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** is the same as between the Tanna'im of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **Rebbi** says a father has the right to declare his son a nazir until the son is a full adult (he brings shte saaros). **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says he may do so until the boy is old enough to make nedarim, which is when he reaches 12 years and a day. Presumably we will say that **Rebbi** holds that a father may make his son a nazir based on a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, and therefore the right continues until adulthood, whereas **R' Yose** holds he may do so based on his chinuch obligation, and since chinuch with respect to nedarim ends at 12 years old, his right to make him a nazir ends then as well!? **A:** It may be that all agree that it is based on a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. The machlokes is that **Rebbi** holds that the concept of a 12 year old boy being fit to make a neder is only D'Rabanan, whereas **R' Yose** says it is a D'Oraisa. **A2:** It may be that all agree that the right to make the son a nazir is based on his chinuch obligation, and that the concept of a 12 year old boy having the ability to make a neder is only D'Rabanan. **Rebbi** holds that the chinuch D'Rabanan trumps the D'Rabanan concept that a 12 year old has the ability to make a neder, and **R' Yose** holds that the D'Rabanan concept trumps the chinuch.
- We can say that the machlokes of **Rebbi and R' Yose** is the same as the machlokes between the Tanna'im in the following Braisa. The Braisa says that when **R' Chanina's** father declared him to be a nazir, **R' Chanina** was brought to **R' Gamliel** to check if he had shte saaros. **R' Yose** says he was brought to be checked if he had reached the age where he had the ability to make nedarim. We can see that the **T"K and R' Yose** argue whether the right to make a son a nazir ends at adulthood or at the age of ability to make nedarim.
  - The Braisa continues and says that **R' Chanina** told **R' Gamliel**, "There is no need to check me. In either case I will be a nazir. If I am still a minor, I will be a nazir based on my father's declaration. If I am an adult, I will make my own declaration of nezirus". **R' Gamliel** kissed him on his head and said, "I am certain that this boy will be a posek in Klal Yisrael". In just a short time, these words came to be.
    - **Q:** The Gemara feels that **R' Chanina** said to **R' Gamliel**, if I have reached the capacity to make nedarim then I will be a nazir on my own, and if I have not yet reached that age, I am a nazir based on my father's declaration. If so, this is a clear proof to **R' Yose**!? **A:** **Rebbi** will explain that **R' Chanina** said, if I have not yet grown shte saaros I will be a nazir based on my father's declaration, and if I have, I will be a nazir based on my own declaration.
    - **Q:** According to **Rebbi**, how could **R' Chanina** have brought korbanos at the end of the nezirus term? If he grew shte saaros during the term of nezirus, neither his father's nezirus nor his own nezirus had a full 30 day term!? According to **R' Yose** this is not difficult to understand, since if he reached the capacity to make nedarim in middle of his father's term, the term would not automatically end, but according to **Rebbi**, who says it is dependent on shte saaros, the arrival of shte saaros would make it end immediately!? **A:** According to **Rebbi**, the only thing **R' Chanina** could do is keep a term of nezirus for 60 days. In that way he could be sure that he had a full 30 day nezirus either before becoming an adult or after, and in that way he would be chayuv to bring the korbanos.