

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Making one's child a nazir (cont.)

Numerous unsuccessful challenges are presented against Reish Lakish's position that a father can declare his son to be a nazir for chinuch purposes.

2) Slaughtering birds and unconsecrated animals in the Beis Hamikdash

In response to the seventh challenge, the Gemara asserted that Reish Lakish holds like R' Yosi the son of R' Yehudah, that there is no Biblical requirement to slaughter birds, nor is there a Biblical prohibition against bringing unconsecrated animals into the Beis Hamikdash.

The Gemara challenges these two assertions from a Baraisa.

R' Acha the son of R' Ika rejects the inference from the Baraisa that led to this challenge.

3) Declaring that one's child be a nazir (cont.)

It is suggested that the dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish parallels a Tannaic dispute.

Two alternate explanations of the dispute are offered which do not relate to the dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish.

It is suggested and accepted that the dispute between Rabbi and R' Yosi the son of R' Yehudah parallels a different Tannaic dispute.

It is noted that R' Chanina's comment in the Baraisa seems to pose a difficulty for Rabbi's position. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Is one obligated to train his daughter to do mitzvos?

2. If שחיטה is not mandated for killing birds, what alternative method could be utilized?

3. When does a father lose the right to make his son a nazir?

4. What did R' Chanina do to impress R' Gamliel?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By the Okner family
 In memory of their grandfather
 Mr. Samuel Matthew
 ר' שמשון בן ר' לוי, ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

The mitzvah of chinuch of nezirus for a child

ורבי יוסי בר חנינא אמר ריש לקיש כדי לחנכו במצוות

The Mishnah taught that only a father may declare that his minor son be a nazir, but a mother does not have this power. Rabbi Yochanan explains that this distinction is based upon a halacha of Moshe m' Sinai. Rabbi Yose bar Chanina in the name of Reish Lakish argues and explains that the reason for this halacha is based upon the mitzvah of chinuch, of educating one's children. If a father sees that his son would benefit by becoming a nazir, he may guide him and discipline him by declaring this status upon him. Nevertheless, Reish Lakish holds that only a father has the obligation of educating his son, and not the mother, and this is why only he may make this pronouncement for the son.

As a result of this declaration on the part of the father, we find that the son will later shave the hair of his head (גילוח). According to Rabbi Yochanan, we can understand that the nezirus of the son is recognized as a Torah law, and shaving the son's head is allowed here as part of the procedure of a nazir, including the פאות which would otherwise be prohibited to cut. However, according to Reish Lakish who explains that the nezirus is only rabbinic due to חינוך, we cannot use a rabbinic law and thereby allow cutting the פאות which the Torah forbids to cut. The Gemara answers that Reish Lakish understands that when the Torah prohibits cutting the hair along the side of the head, this is when only that section of the head is cut, leaving it even with the forehead. However, cutting the entire head of hair is only prohibited rabbinically, and the mitzvah of chinuch here, which is also rabbinic, supercedes and allows this cutting.

The מהר"ץ חיות and Sfas Emes inquire about how the mitzvah of chinuch applies in this situation. A father must educate and train his son to perform mitzvos. The

(Insight...Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 Dr. and Mrs. Gary Hoberman
 בהודאה על כל החסד שעשה ה' עמנו

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 Dr. and Mrs. Moshe Nitekman
 In loving memory of their mother
 מרת חיי רחל בת ר' מרדכי צבי, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Reciting *ברוך שפטרני* when a girl reaches *bas-mitzvah*

קסבר בנו חייב לחנכו בתו אינו חייב לחנכה

He [Reish Lakish] holds that one is obligated to educate his son but one is not obligated to educate his daughter

Poskim disagree about the meaning of the beracha – Blessed is the One who freed me from the punishment of this one. Magen Avrohom¹ writes that the intent of the beracha relates to the fact that a father is punished for not properly educating his son. Once the child reaches adulthood his father expresses thanks that he is no longer accountable for the chinuch of his son. Levush² explains the intent of the beracha in an opposite manner. A child could potentially be punished for the sinful ways of his parent and upon reaching adulthood the child's parent expresses appreciation that his son will no longer be punished for his (the parent's) sins.

A practical difference between these two explanations is whether the beracha is recited when a girl reaches the age of *bas-mitzvah*³. According to Levush there is no logical reason

to distinguish between a son and a daughter since the issue is the child receiving punishment for the sins of the parent. If, however, the issue is the parent's shortcoming with regards to the chinuch of their child, as held by Magen Avrohom, one could argue that the beracha would not apply to a daughter. The basis for this distinction is the position of Reish Lakish in our Gemara where he states that one is obligated to educate his son but one is not obligated to educate his daughter. If Reish Lakish's statement is taken literally it would mean that the father could not be punished for shortcomings in the chinuch of his daughter since it is not his obligation. This conclusion, though, is not definitive since many authorities⁴ maintain that the comment of Reish Lakish is limited to nezirus. In other words, Reish Lakish was not making a sweeping statement that a father is not obligated in the chinuch of his daughter at all; rather he was explaining the Mishnah that implies that a father can make his son into a nazir but he cannot make his daughter into a nezira. ■

1. מגי'א סי' רכ"ה סק"ד.
2. מובא דבריו במגי'א הנ"ל.
3. ע' שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ו אר"ח סי' כ"ט אות ג'.
4. שו"ת יביע אומר הנ"ל. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Educating One's Children

"...בנו חייב לחנכו בתו אינו חייב לחנכה"

"I just don't understand it," a certain man remarked to his Rabbi. "Why do people make the blessing, 'ברוך שפטרני מענשו של זה' for a son but not a daughter? Don't we have an obligation to educate daughters as much as sons?"

The Rabbi replied, "Actually you do have an obligation to educate your daughter in mitzvos just like a son. Although the Gemara in Nazir 29 states that according to Reish Lakish, one need only educate his son, not his daughter, that is only regarding making a son a nazir. Regarding other mitzvos, the Gemara states clearly in Yoma that one must educate his son and daughter to fast on Yom Kippur. The Meiri and Rav Avraham min HaHar, similarly

learn from the Gemara there that one must educate his daughter in mitzvos.

The Rabbi continued, "Despite this fact, the custom has always been not to make this brocho upon one's daughter's *bas-mitzvah*. The Ein Eliezer and the Radal both explain that the main reason one would be punished is for neglecting to teach his son Torah since this is exceedingly difficult. Regarding other mitzvos, teaching a child is not so difficult so one is not likely to be punished for the sins of refraining to properly educate his young daughter. It is much more likely he will have trouble because he has not taught his son Torah."

The Rabbi concluded, "Actually Rav Shlomo Zalman Aurebach, zt"l, would tell most people not to make this brocho with *שם ומלכות* even for a boy. It was only those he knew had truly educated their children whom he allowed to make this important bro-

cho. You are only exempt if you did the job properly!" ■

(Insight...Continued from page 1)

son will be develop good habits, and mitzvah observance will not be a burden for him when he is older. This applies by all positive mitzvos, such as tefillin, esrog, shofar, etc., which the son will invariably have to do. However, nazir is not a mitzvah for which he must be trained. *מהר"ץ חיות* answers that nezirus teaches that a person should not be decadent and pleasure-seeking. This is an appropriate lesson to teach even a child.

Sfas Emes explains that a child is not liable for violating the prohibition of *לא יחל*, but he will be responsible for keeping it once his is *bar-mitzvah*. Therefore, it is proper for a father to train him to fulfill his commitments by declaring that his son observe nezirus when he is still underage. ■