

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Unspecified funds (cont.)

The Gemara explains that the case of birds, which is similar to the case of nazir, is another example where unspecified funds will be used voluntary communal offerings. This is to the exclusion of a Baraisa that holds differently.

R' Ashi presents a precise definition of specified funds.

An alternative version of R' Ashi's definition is presented.

Rava qualifies the rule that unspecified funds go for voluntary communal offerings.

A Baraisa is cited that supports Rava's explanation.

R' Huna in the name of Rav teaches that the Mishnah's ruling concerning unspecified funds applies only to money but if someone set aside an animal to fund his offerings it is considered specified.

R' Nachman elaborates on R' Huna's ruling.

There is a dispute whether a slug is treated as unspecified and everyone agrees that building beams are considered as specified funds.

R' Shimi bar Ashi challenges the premise that only cash and items that can be easily sold for cash are considered unspecified funds and maintains that animals and birds are also considered unspecified funds. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. In what way does the obligation to offer birds parallel the case of nazir?

2. How do we distinguish between specified and unspecified funds?

3. What is done with money set aside for an Olah if the owner dies?

4. When are pairs of birds specified?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Applying the rule of Rav Huna

אמר רב הונא אמר רב לא שנו אלא מעות, אבל בהמה הרי היא כמפורשת

The **מפרש** explains that Rav Huna comes to clarify the opinion of Rabbi Yochanan and the Halacha from Moshe m'Sinai which states that the excess unspecified funds of the nazir offering may be used for **נדבה**. Rav Huna teaches that this only applies to money, but with animals, it always has the status of specified, and the unused funds must be destroyed due to the mixture of chattas funds among it. The case is where the person set aside three animals, but he died before any of them were actually brought as offerings. Although the person did not specify the offering for which each was designated, the matter is self-evident by the nature of the situation. The chattas of a nazir is brought from a female animal, the olah is always from a male, and the ram is for the shelamim. Therefore, the parallel to a case of money for the offerings being left over is where the items were clearly designated. In this case, the chattas must be left to die, and the shelamim and olah may be brought as offerings. The novelty in the comment of Rav Huna is that although the owner/nazir did not verbalize this designation of the animals, it is clear from the nature of the situation for what each animal was to be used, and they may be offered as indicated.

Tosafos (**ד"ה אבל בהמה**) and the Rosh ask that this hardly seems to be insightful, as in the Mishnah later (27a), Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel clearly teaches that if a person consecrates a **כבשה** (female sheep), a **כבש** (male sheep) and an **איל** (ram), they shall be brought as a **חטאת**, an **עולה** and an **אשם** respectively. Therefore, this cannot be the **חידוש** of Rav Huna.

Furthermore, it seems from the context of the Gemara that the animals set aside for the needs of the nazir are items which are not themselves fitting to be a valid **קרבו**, such as an animal which is blemished, or a bar of metal or a wooden beam.

Therefore, Tosafos explains that the animals set aside by the nazir in this context are those which are not eligible for his offerings. For example, where he consecrated three bulls or three goats. The halacha here is that they must graze until they become blemished, at which time the animal will be sold and the funds obtained will be used for animals for the nazir offerings. Nevertheless, the comment of Rav Huna is that these animals have the status of a designated chattas, olah and shelamim. However, it is not treated literally as if these are as these offerings, but as if funds for a chattas, olah and shelamim have been mixed with them. In this case, we do not apply the Halacha from Moshe m'Sinai that unspecified funds be used for **נדבה**. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Specified and unspecified funds

אמר ר' הונא אמר רב לא שנו אלא מעות וכר

R' Huna in the name of Rav taught: This halacha was taught only with regards to money etc.

Rambam¹ rules that if one sets aside a blemished animal for his Korban Nezirus it is treated like unspecified funds (מעות סתומין). There is a dispute² amongst the Poskim regarding the type of animal relevant to this discussion. Some opinions maintain that this halacha only applies to the type of animal that could have been used for a Korban Nazir had it not been blemished. Regarding such animals we could say that they are treated as money when they are in a blemished state. Animals that could not have been brought for a Korban Nazir even if they were the not blemished, due to the fact that it is the wrong species, are automatically treated like unspecified funds. Other authorities maintain that anytime an animal is set aside that could be brought as some type of offering it becomes infused with sanctity and thus may not be redeemed until it develops a blemish. Consequently, this animal is not considered the same as money since it cannot be used at any time to purchase an offering.

The Gemara³ presents a dispute whether unminted metal is considered specified or unspecified. According to the first opinion in the Gemara this metal is not the same as cash, and thus if a person set it aside and then died it would be treated like specified funds and would have to be destroyed. R' Nachman bar Yitzchok disagrees and maintains that this metal is considered the same as cash; therefore, if the nazir set it aside for his offering and died it would be treated like unspecified funds and would be used for olah offerings. Rambam⁴ rules in accordance with the opinion that holds that unminted metal is treated like unspecified funds.

It is also mentioned in the Gemara that if a person set aside a beam of wood, used in construction, to fund his nazir offerings they will be treated like specified funds and they would have to be destroyed if they turn out to be in excess of the necessary amount. Rambam does not make any mention of this case explicitly; consequently authorities debate Rambam's position on the matter. According to some he considers construction beams to be specified funds whereas according to others it is considered unspecified⁵. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ט מהל' נזירות ה"ה.
2. ע' פתחי נזיר שם ס"ק ל"ג.
3. גמ' כו :.
4. רמב"ם שם.
5. פתחי נזיר שם ס"ק ל"ו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Casting it into the Sea

"...ילכו לים המלך"

Today's daf discusses casting money designated for certain sacrifices into the Dead Sea.

In the hectic days before Pesach one must be extra vigilant not only to clean but to think creatively where chametz may have been placed or entered into the house in unusual ways. Unfortunately, one must either learn from the experience of others, or, unfortunately, from one's own mistakes.

One young man found a roll in a cupboard of his small apartment on Pesach, much to his horror. He couldn't believe it. "How can that possibly be? I checked the entire house, includ-

ing that cupboard which I distinctly remember was empty!"

After some careful questioning, his four-year-old admitted to have secreted the roll there from the final meal just before the ביעור. The lad explained, "Everyone told me there would be no more bread and I was afraid I would get hungry and have nothing to eat..."

Once, someone received a gift of vodka which he assumed was not chometz. After Pesach, he learned to his dismay that it had some wheat in it. He called his Rabbi and told him the situation. He finished off his story with a query, "Rabbi, I have two questions. Does my nullification help since I was a mistaken, and I meant to nullify any chometz? Second, it is not a majority of chometz, so can I just put the value of the chometz in the Dead Sea and then drink it?"

"You definitely can't rely on the ביטול," replied the Rabbi. "In terms of whether you can toss the value of the chometz into the Dead Sea, it depends. If the wheat is necessary for the fermentation, it is a דבר המעמיד and cannot be redeemed even though it is after Pesach and the chametz was not the majority. If the vodka would have fermented even without the chometz, it can be redeemed by casting the value of the chometz into the Dead Sea since it is not the sole מעמיד of the beverage and the majority is not chometz.

"But either way," concluded the Rav, "You can't actually drink it, since even redeeming the chometz only permits one to sell it and have pleasure from it, not to eat it!"

May Hashem save us from having any hint of chometz in our possession on Pesach! ■

