

זכתה וקדמה ארבעה דורות בישראל  
למלכות.

מתני' האשה שנדרה בגיור והפרישה  
את בהמתה, ואחר כך היפר לה בעלה.  
אם שלו היתה הבהמה – תצא ותרעה  
בעדר.

ואם שלו היתה הבהמה, החטאת –  
תמות, ועולה – תקרב עולה. שלמים –  
תקרב שלמים, ונאכלין ליום אחד ואינן  
טעונין לחם.

היו לה מעות סתומין – יפלו לנדבה.  
מעות מפורשין, דמי חטאת – ילכו לים  
המלח, לא נהנין ולא מועלין בהן.

דמי עולה – יביאו עולה, ומועלין בהן.  
דמי שלמים – יביאו שלמים, ונאכלין  
ליום אחד, ואין טעונין לחם.

גמ' מאן תנא דבעל לא משתעבד לה?  
אמר רב חסדא: רבנן היא. דאי סלקא  
דעתך רבי יהודה היא – אמאי תצא  
ותרעה בעדר? הא משתעבד לה!

she merited to precede the younger daughter by four generations to the monarchy of the Jewish people. The descendants of Ruth the Moabite ruled over the Jewish people for four generations: Obed, Yishai, David, and Solomon, before the reign of Solomon's son Rehoboam, whose mother was Naamah the Ammonite.

**MISHNA** With regard to a woman who vowed<sup>h</sup> to be a nazirite and separated her animals for her offerings of purity at the end of her term,<sup>8</sup> and afterward her husband nullified her vow, which means that she is not in fact a nazirite, what becomes of these animals? If the animal was his, it shall go out and graze among the flock until it becomes blemished, like regular non-consecrated animals.

And if the animal was hers, different *halakhot* apply to the various offerings: The animal she set aside as a sin-offering must be left to die<sup>n</sup> by being shut in an enclosed area and deprived of food and water, as will be explained in the Gemara. And the animal separated for a burnt-offering is sacrificed on the altar as a burnt-offering, as in any case one may bring a voluntary burnt-offering. As for the one designated for a peace-offering, it is sacrificed as a voluntary peace-offering. And this peace-offering is eaten for only one day, in accordance with the *halakha* of the nazirite's peace-offering, despite the fact that regular peace-offerings may be eaten for two days. But the offering does not require bread, i.e., loaves and wafers, unlike that of a nazirite.

If she had unallocated funds,<sup>h</sup> i.e., she had separated money for her offerings but had not stated which coins were designated for which offering, all the money will be earmarked for communal gift offerings.<sup>n</sup> If she had allocated funds, i.e., she had decided which coins were for the payment of each offering, even if she had not yet purchased the animals, the money for the sin-offering is taken and cast into the Dead Sea, i.e., it must be destroyed, either by being thrown into the sea or by some other means. One may not benefit from it, as it possesses a measure of sanctity, but one also does not misuse property consecrated to the Temple with it. In other words, if one did derive benefit from this money he is not liable to bring an offering for misusing consecrated property.

As for the money for the burnt-offering, a burnt-offering is brought with those coins, and one who benefits from it is liable for misuse of consecrated property, as it is sacred since it can be used toward the purchase of a gift offering. Similarly, with regard to the money for a peace-offering, a peace-offering is brought with those coins, and it is eaten for one day and does not require bread.

**GEMARA** The Gemara inquires: Who is the *tanna* who taught that a husband is not indebted to his wife, i.e., he is not required to provide her with her obligatory offerings? It is evident that the *tanna* of the mishna maintains that this is the case, as he rules that the animal does not remain sacred if it belonged to her husband. Rav Hisda said: It is the opinion of the Rabbis. As, if it should enter your mind that it is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, why should an animal that belonged to the husband go out and graze among the flock until it becomes blemished? After all, the husband is indebted and required to give her the offerings she requires, which means that her consecration is valid even if she used his animals.

HALAKHA

A woman who vowed, etc. – האשה שנדרה וכו' – With regard to a woman who took a vow of naziriteship, set aside animals for this purpose, and afterward her husband nullified her vow, if the animals belonged to him they are set free to graze with the rest of the flock. If she had exclusive ownership of the animals, the sin-offering must be left to die, the burnt-offering is sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and the peace-offering is sacrificed as a peace-offering. However, this peace-offering must be eaten in one day and does not require bread, unlike standard peace-offerings (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 9:9).

If she had unallocated funds, etc. – הויו לה מעות סתומין וכו' – With regard to a woman who took a vow of naziriteship, set aside her own money to purchase the offerings, and then her husband proceeded to nullify her vow, if she had not specified which coins were for which animal, they are all used for the purchase of communal gift offerings. If she had specified, then the money for the sin-offering is cast into the Dead Sea, i.e., it is prohibited to benefit from it but one who does so has not misused sacred property. The money for the burnt-offering is used for the purchase of a burnt-offering. Lastly, the money for the peace-offering is used to buy a peace-offering, which is eaten for one day and does not require bread (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 9:10 and *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Me'ila* 4:3).

BACKGROUND

A nazirite...separated her animals at the end of her term – גיור והפרישה את בהמתה: A nazirite who completes the term of naziriteship must bring two lambs as offerings: One female as a sin-offering and one male as a burnt-offering, and a ram as a peace-offering (Numbers 6:13–21). The nazirite must be shorn of all hair of the head, which is burned beneath the pot in which the ram sacrificed as a peace-offering is cooked.

NOTES

The sin-offering must be left to die – ההטאת תמות: Although one might think that the animal should be considered entirely non-sacred, as it was consecrated in error, this is not the case, as explained by the Gemara earlier (21b), in accordance with the variant readings and interpretations of the discussion there. Some commentaries explain that this is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar that a nazirite sins through the very acceptance of naziriteship, and therefore the animal retains a measure of sanctity and does not revert to its earlier state (*Tosafot*). Others maintain that the animal is considered a sin-offering whose owner has gained atonement by means of another, as she is no longer in need of it (Commentary on *Nazir*). In the Jerusalem Talmud it is similarly stated that the reason is that the husband's nullification does not uproot the vow entirely. Consequently, although she need not observe naziriteship at this stage, because the consecration of the sin-offering was proper at the time it must now be left to die rather than be set free as a non-sacred animal.

Will be earmarked for communal gift offerings – יפלו לנדבה: In other words, the money is placed in a special box in the Temple designated for this money (see *Shekalim* 6:5). The mishna there (6:6) explains that the money from this box was used for the purchase of burnt-offerings, whose hides went to the priests. Some commentaries maintain that in this case the woman herself must use the money for gift burnt-offerings (Meiri).

HALAKHA

A person brings the offering of a rich man, etc. – אָדָם – מְבִיא קֶרְבֵּן עֶשְׂרֵי וְכוּ: A husband must provide all the offerings that his wife is obligated to bring. If he is poor he supplies the offering of a poor man; if he is rich he gives her those of a rich person (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Shegagot 10:6).

NOTES

Rather, what are the circumstances, etc. – אֲלֵא הֵיכִי דְמִי – וְכוּ: Some commentaries explain that this is the conclusion of the previous argument: The mishna cannot be in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis because if he did not give her the animal it is not consecrated at all, and if he did transfer its ownership it is entirely hers, and therefore the sin-offering must be left to die. Consequently, there is no way to explain the mishna in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Commentary on Nazir). According to this explanation, in this context the phrase: Obligated to her, means that the animal belongs to her. Other commentaries point out that according to the explanation of the Ran on Nedarim 83a, the Rabbis concede that the husband is obligated to fund his wife's offerings, and this is the meaning of this statement (Keren Ora). Others maintain that the Gemara there is referring to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda (see Tosafot).

דְּתַנֵּי, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: אָדָם מְבִיא קֶרְבֵּן עֶשְׂרֵי עַל אִשְׁתּוֹ.

וְכֵן כָּל קֶרְבָּנוֹתֶיהָ שֶׁהִיא חַיִּיבָתָה, שׂוֹבֵךְ כֹּתֵב לָהּ "כָּל אַחֲרֵיֹת דְּאִית לִיךְ עָלַי מִן קִדְמַת דְּנָא".

רַבָּא אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ תִימָא רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, כִּי מִשְׁעֵבַד לָהּ – בְּמִילְתָּא דְּצָרִיכָא לָהּ, בְּמִילְתָּא דְּלֹא צָרִיכָא לָהּ – לֹא.

אֵיכָא דְּאָמְרִי: מֵאֵן תִּנָּא? אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הִיא, וְכִי מִשְׁעֵבַד לָהּ – בְּמִילְתָּא דְּצָרִיכָא לָהּ, בְּמִילְתָּא דְּלֹא צָרִיכָא לָהּ – לֹא. דְּאִי רַבֵּנן – לֹא מִשְׁעֵבַד לָהּ כָּלֵל.

אֲלֵא הֵיכִי דְמִי דְּמִשְׁעֵבַד לָהּ – כְּגוֹן דְּאִקְנִיָּיהָ לָהּ, וְכִינן דְּאִקְנִי לָהּ – הָוֵה דְּנַפְשָׁהּ.

The Gemara provides the source for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda: As it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: A person brings the offering of a rich man<sup>1</sup> on behalf of his wife. If a wife is obligated to bring an offering that is different depending on whether she is wealthy or poor, e.g., the offering of a child-bearing woman, then even if she herself does not own enough to be considered wealthy, if her husband can afford it he must bring the offering of a rich person on her behalf.

And similarly, he brings all her offerings that she is obligated to bring, even those whose obligation preceded their marriage. The reason is that he wrote to her in her marriage contract like this: I accept upon myself all claims of guarantee that you have upon me from beforehand. These obligations include her offerings.

Rava said: You can even say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and nevertheless the husband is under no obligation if he nullified her vow. The reason is as follows: When is he obligated to bring her offerings? It is only in the case of a matter that is necessary for her to bring. However, in the case of a matter that is not necessary for her to bring, he is under no such obligation. Here, too, once he has nullified her naziriteship, she is no longer in need of this offering.

Some say a different version of this discussion: Who is the tanna who taught that only a husband who nullified his wife's vow is exempt from providing her offerings? Rav Hisda said that it is Rabbi Yehuda, and his opinion is as follows: When is he indebted to fund her offerings? It is in the case of a matter that is necessary for her to bring, but in the case of a matter that is not necessary for her to bring, he is under no such obligation. As, if it is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, he is not mortgaged to her in this regard at all.

Rather, what are the circumstances<sup>N</sup> in which he is obligated to provide her offering, according to the opinion of the Rabbis? For example, if he transferred the animal to her possession. But in that case, since he has transferred it to her, it is her own, which means that she has effectively separated the offering from her own property. The mishna cannot be referring to this situation, as the animal does not revert to a non-sacred state in a case of this kind. Evidently, the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

Perek IV Daf 24 Amud b

רַבָּא אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ תִימָא רַבֵּנן; כִּי מְקַנֵּי לָהּ נָמִי – בְּמִילְתָּא דְּצָרִיכָא לָהּ, בְּמִילְתָּא דְּלֹא צָרִיכָא לָהּ – לֹא מְקַנֵּי לָהּ.

Rava said: You can even say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and the reason the animal loses its sanctity is that even when he transfers it to her,<sup>N</sup> he does so for a matter that is necessary for her to bring, but for a matter that is not necessary for her to bring, he does not transfer it to her.

NOTES

Even when he transfers it to her, etc. – כִּי מְקַנֵּי לָהּ נְמִי וְכוּ: Some commentaries explain that the husband said to her that the animal is hers if she needs it for her atonement (Commentary on Nazir). Others claim that if he makes an explicit condition of this kind, it is obvious that the acquisition is repealed if she no longer requires atonement. Rather, the husband simply said to her that he is giving her this animal for the purpose of her atonement (Keren Ora). Rabbeinu Peretz, citing Rabbeinu Meir, asks: By

saying that the animal is for his wife's naziriteship, the husband has effectively upheld her vow. How, then, can he later nullify it? And if he issued no stipulation at all, why isn't the animal considered hers in all regards, like any gift a man gives his wife? He answers that the husband said to his wife that if she requires any animal for an offering she may take one of his (see Tosafot and Rabbeinu Todros).

Any item that a woman acquires, her husband acquires – **מה שקנתה אשה קנה בעלה** – If one gives a gift to a married woman, the item itself belongs to the woman but any benefit derived from it goes to her husband. The same applies to any money that enters her possession, whether by way of inheritance, lost property, or if she was paid a fine. In all these cases the money belongs to her, but the profits belong to her husband (Rambam *Sefer Kinyan, Hilkhot Zekhiya UMattana* 3:12 and *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 7:17; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 85:7).

On the condition that your husband has no, etc. – **על מנת שאין לבעליך וכו'**: If one gives a gift to a married woman on the condition that her husband has no rights to it, the husband does not acquire the gift. Some authorities (Ra'avad; Rabbeinu Tam) maintain that if the giver did not specify what the gift was for, even if he said she may use it as she wishes, the husband acquires the profits notwithstanding the condition (Rambam *Sefer Kinyan, Hilkhot Zekhiya UMattana* 3:13 and *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 7:17; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 222:1).

One who separates money for his naziriteship – **המפריש**: With regard to one who separates money for his naziriteship without specifying for which offering they are to be used, it is prohibited to derive benefit from them. However, one who did so has not misused consecrated property, as all of the money is fit to be used for peace-offerings, which are not subject to the *halakhot* of misuse until their blood has been sprinkled on the altar. If the owner died, all of the money goes toward gift offerings. If he designated specific coins for particular offerings, the money for the sin-offering is taken and cast into the Dead Sea, i.e., it is prohibited to benefit from it but one is not liable for misuse if one does so; the money of the burnt-offering is used for a burnt-offering and one who benefits from it is liable for misuse of consecrated property; while the money of the peace-offering goes toward a peace-offering, which is eaten for one day and does not require bread (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 9:3 and *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Me'ila* 4:3).

## NOTES

**לֹא תִיִּיב עַל פְּרִיֶיךָ** – The commentaries read this as a shortened form of: You shall not sit but instead you must stand on your feet and explain this matter to me. They interpret it in this fashion because the command: Sit on your feet, does not appear to make sense. Some suggest that it might have been the custom to sit on the ground cross-legged (*Orah Mishor*).

## BACKGROUND

The Dead Sea – **ים המלח**: The expression: Dead Sea, can sometimes refer to any of the saltwater seas, as opposed to freshwater lakes. However, it usually refers specifically to the Dead Sea, also referred to in talmudic sources as the Sea of Sodom. Any item from which it is prohibited to derive benefit may be thrown into the Dead Sea, as there are no fishermen or people who will come to retrieve items thrown there. It is also possible that due to the high concentration of salt in the Dead Sea, items cast into it will become rusty and decayed in a short period of time, rendering them useless, as all items placed in the Dead Sea quickly become covered with a thick layer of salt.



Salt-covered rock on the Dead Sea shore

“אם שלה היתה בהמתה חטאת תמות” וְעוֹלַת תִּקְרַב. היא מנא לה? האמרת: מה שקנתה אשה קנה בעלה! אמר רב פפא: שקמצתה מעיסתה. איבעית אימא: דאקני לה אחר, ואמר לה “על מנת שאין לבעליך רשות בהן.”

§ The mishna teaches: **If the animal was hers, the sin-offering must be left to die and the burnt-offering is sacrificed.** The Gemara asks: **She**, this married woman, **from where** does she have her own property? **Haven't you said** as a principle that with regard to any item **that a woman acquires, her husband automatically acquires**<sup>h</sup> it from her? **Rav Pappa said:** This is referring to a case **where she saved it from her dough**, i.e., she was able to buy the animal with the money she saved by eating less. **And if you wish, say instead that another person transferred the property to her, and he said to her that he is doing so on the condition that your husband has no<sup>h</sup> rights to it.** In that case the wife is the exclusive owner of the animal.

“העולה תקרב עולה והשלמים תקרב” כו'. אמר ליה שמואל לאבבה בר איהו: לא תיתיב על פרייך עד דאמרת לי הדרא מילתא: ואלו הן ארבעה אילים שאינן טעונין לחם: שלו, ושלה, ושלאחר המיתה, ושלאחר פפא.

§ The mishna taught that **the burnt-offering is sacrificed as a burnt-offering and the peace-offering is sacrificed as a peace-offering.** Shmuel said to Avuh bar Ihi: **You shall not sit on your feet<sup>n</sup> until you say and explain to me this matter** taught in a *baraita*: **And these are the four rams of the nazirite's offering that do not require bread to be brought with them**, in contrast to the usual practice: **His, hers, the one brought after death, and the one brought after the nazirite has gained atonement** by means of a different offering.

שלה – היא דאמרן. שלו – דתנן: האי ש מדיר את בנו בגוי, ואין האשה מדרת את בנה בגוי. גילח או שגלחהו קרובים, מיחה או שמיחהו קרובים:

The Gemara clarifies this statement: **Hers**, this is **that which we just said**, the offering of a woman who separated an animal of her own before her husband proceeded to nullify her vow. **His, as we learned in a mishna (28b): A man can vow his son to become a nazirite, i.e., he can apply a vow of naziriteship to his minor son, but a woman cannot vow her son to become a nazirite.** If the son objects, either of his own initiative or at the behest of others, his father's vow is canceled. Consequently, if the boy **shaved his hair** during the period of naziriteship, thereby demonstrating his desire not to be a nazirite, **or if relatives shaved him**, or even if the minor performed no action at all but simply **objected, or if his relatives made him object**, his naziriteship is canceled.

היו לו מעות סתומין – יפלו לנדבה. מעות מפורשין, דמי חטאת – ילכו לים המלח, דמי עולה – יביאו עולה, ומועלין בהן. דמי שלמים – יביאו שלמים, ונאכלין ליום אחד, ואינן טעונין לחם.

In that case, if **he had unallocated funds**, which had been consecrated for the child's offerings but not designated for any particular offering, **all the money will be earmarked for communal gift offerings.** If he had **allocated funds** designated for a particular offering, **the money for a sin-offering is taken and cast into the Dead Sea;<sup>b</sup> the money for a burnt-offering is brought as a burnt-offering, and one who benefits from it is liable for misuse of consecrated property; and the money for a peace-offering is brought as a peace-offering and it is eaten for one day and does not require bread.**

שלאחר מיתה מנלן – דתנא: המפריש מעות לגוירו – לא נהנין ולא מועלין בהן, מפני שהן ראויין להביא בכולן שלמים.

With regard to a ram **that is after its owner's death, from where do we derive that this offering requires no bread?** **As it is taught in a mishna (Me'ila 18a):** With regard to **one who separates money for his naziriteship<sup>h</sup>** without specifying an offering, he may **not derive benefit from them, but one who benefits from it is not liable for misuse of consecrated property.** Why is he not liable to bring an offering for misuse of consecrated property? It is **because the money is fit to bring peace-offerings with all of it**, and no misuse is effected by deriving benefit from a peace-offering until after its blood has been sprinkled.

מת והיו לו מעות סתומים – יפלו לנדבה. מעות מפורשין, דמי חטאת – יוליד לים המלח לא נהנין ולא מועלין בהן. דמי עולה – יביאו עולה, ומועלין בהן. דמי שלמים – יביאו שלמים, ונאכלין ליום אחד, ואינן טעונין לחם.

The mishna continues: **If the one who set aside the money died and he had unallocated funds, they are all allocated for communal gift offerings.** If he left behind **allocated funds**, with regard to **the money for a sin-offering, one must take it and cast it into the Dead Sea; one may not derive benefit from it but one who benefits from it is not liable for misuse of consecrated property. The money for a burnt-offering is brought as a burnt-offering, and one who benefits from it is liable for misuse of consecrated property. The money for a peace-offering is brought as a peace-offering, and it is eaten for one day and does not require bread.** This is the case of a ram after its owner's death that does not require bread.

**HALAKHA**

And all the other peace-offerings of a nazirite, etc. – וּשְׂאֵר כָּל שְׁלַמֵי נָזִיר וְכוּ': The peace-offerings of a nazirite that were slaughtered not in accordance with their mitzva or not for their sake are valid, but the owners have not fulfilled their obligation. These offerings are eaten for one day and one night, and they require neither bread, nor the priestly gifts, nor the foreleg (Rambam *Sefer Hafl'a'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:12 and *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 15:20).

**NOTES**

**שְׂלֵא כְּמִצְוֹתָן – Not in accordance with their mitzva** – Some commentaries explain that this refers to offerings slaughtered not for their own sake (*Tosafot*, citing Rashi on *Menahot* 48b). In most cases, the fact that the slaughtering or the sprinkling of the blood was not performed for the sake of the appropriate offering does not invalidate it entirely. Rather, the offering is valid, but it does not count toward its owner's obligation, i.e., he does not gain atonement through it. Some commentaries accept this interpretation, despite the objection that the Gemara should have said this explicitly. Rashi on *Menahot* cites an alternative explanation, which is mentioned by the Commentary on *Nazir* here: One erred in the offering itself, e.g., he brought a sheep in its first year instead of one in its second year, as required. Alternatively, he slaughtered the peace-offering before he completed his term of naziriteship (Rabbeinu Aziel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*).

שְׂלֵאֲחַר כִּפְּרָה – סִבְרָא הוּא: שְׂלֵאֲחַר הַמִּיתָה מֵאֵי טַעַם – דְּלֵא חֲזִיא לְכִפְּרָה, שְׂלֵאֲחַר כִּפְּרָה נָמִי – הָא לֹא חֲזִיא לְכִפְּרָה.

As for the ram that is after atonement, whose owner has used a different offering to achieve atonement, the *halakha* that this offering does not require bread is not taught explicitly. Rather, it is based on logical reasoning: What is the reason that no bread is brought in the case of a ram that is sacrificed after the death of its owner? It is that this offering is not fit for atonement, as no atonement is granted to the dead through offerings. With regard to a ram that is sacrificed after atonement too, it is no longer fit for atonement, as the owner has already gained atonement by means of a different animal.

וְתוּ לִיכָּא? וְהֵאֵיבָא: וּשְׂאֵר כָּל שְׁלַמֵי נָזִיר שֶׁשְּׁחָטָן שְׂלֵא כְּמִצְוֹתָן – בְּשָׂרִים, וְלֹא עוֹלִין לְבַעֲלִים לְשׁוּם חֻבָּה, וְנִאֶכְלִין לְיוֹם אֶחָד, וְאֵינָן טְעוּנִין לֹא לְחֵם וְלֹא וְרוּעַ.

The Gemara asks: And is there nothing else? Are there no other instances of a peace-offering of a nazirite that does not require bread, apart from the aforementioned cases? But isn't there the following *halakha*: And with regard to all the other peace-offerings of a nazirite<sup>h</sup> that were slaughtered not in accordance with their mitzva,<sup>n</sup> e.g., if the ram was not of the proper age, they are fit offerings and may be eaten, but they do not count toward the owner's obligation, i.e., he must bring another offering. The *baraita* continues: And these offerings are eaten for one day, like regular peace-offerings of a nazirite, and they require neither bread nor the foreleg, unlike the peace-offering of a nazirite. This is another example of a nazirite's peace-offering that does not require bread.

כְּמִצְוֹתָן קָא חֲשִׁיב, שְׂלֵא כְּמִצְוֹתָן לָא קָא חֲשִׁיב.

The Gemara answers: In the above list the *tanna* includes only offerings that were sacrificed in accordance with their mitzva; he does not include animals that were sacrificed not in accordance with their mitzva.

”הֵיוּ לוֹ מַעוֹת סְתוּמִים יִפְּלוּ לְגַדְבָּה.”

It was stated above, with regard to one who separated money for his naziriteship and then died, that if he had unallocated funds, they are all allocated for communal gift offerings.

Perek IV  
Daf 25 Amud a

וְהֵלֵא דְּמֵי חֲטָאת מְעוֹרְבִין בָּהֶן! אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הֲלֵכָה הִיא בְּנִזְיֹר. רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: ”לְכָל נְדָרֵיהֶם וְלְכָל נְדָבוֹתָם” הַתּוֹרָה אָמְרָה: מוֹתֵר נָזִיר יִהְיֶה לְגַדְבָּה.

The Gemara asks: But the money for the sin-offering is mingled with these unallocated funds. How can it all be used for gift burnt-offerings? Rabbi Yohanan said: It is an accepted *halakha* with regard to a nazirite that his unallocated funds are used for gift offerings, despite the fact that they include the value of a sin-offering. Reish Lakish said: The verse states: “Whether for any of their vows or for any of their gift offerings, which are brought to the Lord as a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 22:18). In this verse, the Torah states that the surplus of a vow shall be for a gift offering. Here too, if the vow of naziriteship cannot be fulfilled, due to the death of the one who took the vow, the money is for a gift offering.

בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן, דְּאָמַר: הֲלֵכָה הִיא בְּנִזְיֹר – אָמְטוּ לְהַכִּי, סְתוּמִין – אִין, מְפוֹרְשִׁין – לֹא. אֵלֵא לְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ: ”לְכָל נְדָרֵיהֶם וְלְכָל נְדָבוֹתָם” – מֵאֵי אִיזְיָא סְתוּמִין? אִפִּילוּ מְפוֹרְשִׁין!

The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan, who said that it is a *halakha* with regard to a nazirite, it is for this reason that if the funds were unallocated, yes, the money is used for gift offerings, but if they were allocated, no, they may not be used for this purpose, as this is the *halakha* passed down by tradition. However, according to the opinion of Reish Lakish, who derives the *halakha* from the verse: “For any of their vows or for any of their gift offerings,” why state specifically unallocated funds; even allocated money should be used for gift offerings after the death of their owner.