



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

Nazir Daf Lamed

MISHNA

- A man can bring korbanos for his own nezirus from the assets that his father had set aside for his own nezirus, but a woman may not do so.
 - How is this so? If a son and his father were both nezirim at the same time and the father separated unspecified money for his nezirus obligations and the father then died, **R' Yose** says the money is to be used for voluntary olah offerings of the tzibbur, and the son may not use this money for his own nezirus obligations.
 - What is the case where a son may use his father's nezirus assets for his own nezirus obligation? If the father was a nazir and he separated unspecified money for his nezirus obligations and he then died, and the son then accepts nezirus on himself on the condition that he can use his father's nezirus money for his own obligation, he may use that money for his own obligation.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is nezirus different in that a son may use the designated money of his father for his obligation? **A: R' Yochanan** says it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai that allows this.
- **Q:** It is obvious that a daughter could not use her father's money for her nezirus obligation, because only a son inherits his father, and not a daughter!? **A:** The chiddush is that even if there are no sons, in which case the daughter inherits, the Halacha teaches that she may still not use that money for herself.
- **Q:** Do the **Rabanan** argue on **R' Yose** of the Mishna or not? If they do argue, do they argue on the first case (and say that even when they are nezirim together the son may use the father's money for his obligation) or do they only argue on the last case (and say that even then the son can't use the money)? **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer, R' Meir, and R' Yehuda** all say that even in the first case of our Mishna the son would be able to use the funds of his father for the nezirus obligation.
- **Q: Rabbah** asked, what if there are two sons who are nezirim (in a case where they would be able to use the money the father had designated)? Do we say that the Halacha is meant to follow the laws of inheritance, and therefore each son is entitled to use half the money, or do we say the Halacha is independent of the laws of inheritance, and therefore whoever accepted the nezirus first is entitled to full use?
 - **Q: Rava** asked, what if one son was a bechor and the other was not, do we follow the laws of inheritance and the bechor gets a double portion of these funds, or is the Halacha independent of these laws and either son may get full use of the funds? Even if we say it follows the laws of inheritance, maybe this is considered kodashim and the bechor does not get double of kodashim or maybe we say that this follows the general rules of inheritance?
 - **Q:** What if the father was a permanent nazir and the son is a regular nazir, or visa-versa? Do we say the Halacha was only said to apply to regular nezirus or not?
 - **Q:** If we say that since they are both tahor nezirim it still applies, **R' Ashi** asked, what about if one of them was tahor and the funds that were separated for tumah korbanos are now going to be used for tahor nazir korbanos, or visa-versa? What would the halacha be? **A: TEIKU.**

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MI SHE'AMAR!!!