

1 Adar 5783
Feb. 22, 2023



Nazir Daf 30

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishnah

A man shaves (*he may complete his nezirus, i.e. bring the korbanos, using the money that his father set aside for his own korbanos*) on the *nezirus* of his father, but a woman does not. What is the case? A person’s father was a *nazir* who separated money for his *korbanos* without specifying which parts of the money should be used for each *korban*. The father then died. If his son states, “I am a *nazir* on the condition that I will shave using the money of my father,” Rabbi Yosi rules that his father’s money should be used for voluntary offerings and he does not use the money of his father (*for the korbanos of nezirus*). What is the case of someone who does shave on the *nezirus* of his father? Someone who was a *nazir* at the same time as his father, and his father proceeded to separate unspecified money for his *korbanos* and then died, he may use the money to shave (*bring korbanos*) from his father’s *nezirus*. (30a1)

Why Mention “Only a Son?”

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason for this (*law that only a son can do so and not a daughter*)? Rabbi Yochanan answers: This is a law Moshe received from Har Sinai regarding *nazir* (*that was passed down orally but not written in the Torah*).

The *Gemora* asks: This is obvious! There is no reason to assume that a daughter should take the place of the *korbanos* of her father, as a son inherits his father, while his sister does not receive any inheritance!

The *Gemora* answers: The Mishnah had to say this in a case where there is only a daughter and no son. One might think that the law Moshe received was that inheritors can bring the *korbanos* of their father. This is why the Mishnah had to say that it only applies to a son, not a daughter (*even if she is the only inheritor*). (30a2 – 30b1)

Do the Rabbanan Agree?

The *Gemora* inquires: Do the Rabbanan agree to Rabbi Yosi or not? If you will say they argue, do they argue regarding the beginning or end of the Mishnah?

The *Gemora* answers this question from a Baraisa. The Baraisa states: What is the case of someone who does shave on the *nezirus* of his father? Someone who was a *nazir* at the same time as his father, and his father proceeded to separate unspecified money for his *korbanos* and then died, he may use the money to shave (*bring korbanos*) from his father’s

nezirus. [The Baraisa now discusses another case.] A person's father was a nazir who separated money for his korbanos without specifying which parts of the money should be used for each korban. The father then died. If his son states, "I am a nazir on the condition that I will shave using the money of my father," Rabbi Yosi rules that his father's money should be used for gift offerings and he does not use the money of his father (for the korbanos of nezirus). Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Yehudah, and Rabbi Meir argue that this someone who shaves from the nezirus of his father. [This is the reading of the Gemora according to the text of "Rashi." "Rashi" explains that this proves that the other tannaim argue on both the first and second part of the Baraisa. They also argue that in the first case the son cannot shave based on the nezirus of the father.] (30b1)

Rabbah inquired: If the father had two sons who were nezirim, what is the law? Is the law passed down from Moshe that whoever shaves first can use the money, or is it akin to inheritance and they should split the money?

Rava inquired: What if he has two sons, one a firstborn and one a regular son? Do we say this is a law passed down that is not linked to inheritance, and therefore the firstborn cannot just take an amount proportionate to his inheritance? Or do we say that it is linked to inheritance, and he therefore takes an amount proportionate to his inheritance?

Rava continues: If it is linked to inheritance, do we say that he only takes this amount when his father stated that the money should be for his nezirus (a term that does not specifically mention korbanos and

therefore tied to the mundane category of inheritance)? Or do we say that he even takes this amount if his father that this money should be used for the korbanos of his nezirus?

Additionally, if (in the case of the Mishnah above) his father is a nazir olam and he is a regular nazir, or if he is a nazir olam and his father is a regular nazir, what is the law? Was the law passed down from Moshe only when they were regular nezirim, or even when one of them was a nazir olam? Additionally, it is possible to say that this law is only talking about two pure nezirim. Rav Ashi asks: What about a case where one is pure but one is not? The Gemora leaves the question unresolved. (30b1 – 30b2)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, MI SHE'AMAR

DAILY MASHAL

It is written (Vayikra 10:12): and Moshe spoke ... and to Elazar and Issamar, his (Aharon's) remaining sons. The question is asked: How can the Torah use the term 'remaining'? the Ta"z (Y"D 43:7) rules that 'remaining' only applies when it is a minority, and here it is precisely equal, as they are two of the four sons of aharon!?

Imrei Shefer answers: since Nadav was the firstborn, he was entitled to a double portion; accordingly, he was regarded as two in the eyes of his father. It emerges that when Nadav and Avihu died, it was as if three of Aharon's sons died; thus there were two remaining, indeed a minority.