

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעילוי נשמת צבי בן יחזקאל יוסף גרין, מחסידי דעעש  
From the Grin family, Sao Paulo, Brazil

## 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. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Daveed Rine  
In memory of their father  
הרב אברהם אליהו בן הרב אהרן משה, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Joey Stern  
In memory of their father  
ר' חיים משה בן ר' אברהם הלוי, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
Rabbi and Mrs. Shmuel Kurtz  
In memory of their mother  
מרת זיסל בת ר' חיים נחמן, ע"ה

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Two sons and the father's nazir funds*

בעי רבה יש לו שני בנים נזירים, מהו?

The question of Rabbah is regarding a case where, as he concluded his nezirus, a father set aside money for his own offerings to be brought, but he then died. The Halacha from Moshe m'Sinai teaches us that these funds may be used for his son to pay for his nazir offerings. The question is, however, what is the halacha if the man has two sons? Are the parameters of the Halacha from Moshe m'Sinai such that whoever among the sons shaves to complete his nezirus first merits to use all the money for himself, or do the rules demand that we divide the money among all sons equally as inheritors? Perhaps the halacha is that the father's money which was set for his nazir offerings is treated as his regular assets, such that it should be divided among the sons, regardless of which of the sons is ready first to disburse the funds for a nazir offering.

Tosafos and Rosh explain that the issue is, according to Rabbi Yose, where the sons declared their intent to be nezirim after the death of the father, and their nezirus was accepted with the clear intent to use the resources of the father. According to Rabbanan, the case can even be where the sons were already nezirim, or where they had declared their intent to be nezirim during the lifetime of the father.

Rabbi Obadiah of Bertinoro and Rambam in his Commentary to the Mishnah, rule that the first of the sons to use the money merits to have it all for himself, and the money is not divided as inheritance. Rabbi Akiva Eiger notes that this issue was left unresolved in the Gemara, as well as two other inquiries of Rabbah and one from Rav Ashi regarding technical applications of the Halacha from Moshe m'Sinai. Why, then, do these Rishonim determine with certainty that the answer to this question is that the first one to use the money merits to have it? This is especially puzzling in light of the rule of Rambam that whenever the Gemara pursues a particular alternative using the "אם תמצוי לומר" expression, this is an indication of the halacha. Here, the Gemara pursues the possibility of the money being inheritance with this expression, thus seemingly signaling that the sons should divide the money.

רש"י explains that the opinion of Rif and Rambam in general in these situations is that if one of the two parties grabs the funds for himself, he may keep the money. Here, too, the sons perhaps should have divided the money. Regardless, though, if one grabbed it, he may keep it. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Erasing part of a suffix to Hashem's name

בית שמאי אומרים הקדש בטעות הקדש

Beis Shammai maintains that an item mistakenly sanctified is nonetheless sacred

There<sup>1</sup> was once a sofer who was supposed to write the word א-להיך but mistakenly thought he was supposed to write the word א-להים. After he made what looks like a "ה" he realized that he was supposed to make a "ך" rather than a "ם" so he extended the right leg to the length of a "ך" and then scratched off the left leg so he would be left with a "ך".

The question this raises is whether it was permitted to erase part of a letter that was originally written as a suffix to Hashem's name. Shulchan Aruch<sup>2</sup> states that not only is it prohibited to erase Hashem's name but it is also prohibited to erase even a suffix to Hashem's name. Accordingly, the left leg of what originally was to be a "ם" would seemingly qualify as a suffix to Hashem's name and therefore should be invested with sanctity. Consequently, it should have been prohibited to erase the left leg.

Teshuvos Daas Kohen<sup>3</sup> writes that it is clear to him that there is no prohibition against erasing the left leg of the name and he bases his position on the premise that when an object is mistakenly sanctified (הקדש בטעות) it does not acquire any sanctity whatsoever, unlike the opinion of Beis Shamai in the Mishnah who maintain that an object mistak-

# REVIEW and Remember

1. Under what conditions is it permitted to use his father's funds for his own nazir offerings?
2. Why was it thought to be obvious that a daughter may not use her father's funds for her own haircut?
3. What is the case that is disputed by Rabanan and R' Yosi?
4. Is a son permitted to use the nazir funds if his father was a different variety of nazir?

enly sanctified is nonetheless sanctified. Regarding this point, however, he draws a distinction between the actual name of Hashem that was written by mistake and a suffix to Hashem's name that was written in error. Concerning Hashem's name he maintains that even if it was written in error it is nonetheless sacred; according to some authorities this is a Biblical law and according to others it is Rabbinic. This is different from suffixes in that there is no precedent that indicates that suffixes become sanctified when written in error and therefore, halacha will adopt a lenient approach that permits erasing the suffix that was written in error. ■

1. ע' באריכות בשו"ת דעת כהן עניני יו"ד סי' קס"ה.
2. שו"ע יו"ד סי' רע"ו סעי' טו'.
3. שו"ת דעת כהן הנ"ל. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## True Comfort

"האיש מגלח על נזירות אביו..."

The following is from a letter that Rav Wolbe, zt"l, sent to another gadol who lost his mother in 1977:

"...During your shivah I was unable to visit and comfort your precious family...so I am writing the following lines in an effort to comfort you. Comforting a mourner does not entail enabling him to forget his mourning, as many mistakenly believe. We see this from the verse in Parshas Chayei Sora, 'And Yitzchak was comforted after his mother...' He was

comforted when he returned to the tent and saw that everything was on exactly the same spiritual level as when his mother was alive. From here we learn the definition of true consolation. When someone loses a relative, they often find that they had been leaning on the parent to enable their spiritual level. For this reason, people often fall spiritually after the death of a close relative. This, then, is the definition of consolation and comfort: to encourage the mourners and help prevent them from falling spiritually.

The letter continues, "...Your mother, the daughter of gedolim, surely helped you stand at your present exalted level... To one as understanding as your-

self, it is surely apparent that this is an opportunity for spiritual growth to ensure that the new generation without her will not fall short of the earlier generation in any way, but will continue to grow spiritually, maintaining the high standards of the past. This is an aspect of: "כי אבי ואמי עזבוני והי' יאספני" –for my father and mother have abandoned me, but Hashem will gather me in'..."

Rav Wolbe's words help us to understand the Mishna that a son can become a nazir and bring the offerings that his deceased father set aside for his own nezirus. "כי אבי ואמי עזבוני והי' יאספני" - This symbolically shows that the new generation is committed to live up to the high standards of the old. ■

