

אמר ליה: וליטעמין, הא דתנן, רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: הביא שלש בהמות ולא פירש, הראויה לחטאת – תקרב חטאת, לעולה – תקרב עולה, לשלמים – תקרב שלמים. אמאי? הא אמות בהמה לאו כמפורשת דמיא!

Rav Pappa said to him: And according to your reasoning, which leads to the conclusion that all items can have the status of unallocated funds, consider that which we learned in a mishna (45a): Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If one brought three different animals for his naziriteship and did not specify which was for which offering, that which is fit for a sin-offering, a ewe, is sacrificed as a sin-offering; the animal suitable for a burnt-offering, a male sheep or bull, is sacrificed as a burnt-offering; and the animal fit for a peace-offering, any other male or female, is sacrificed as a peace-offering. But according to your opinion, why is this so? Didn't you say that an animal is not considered as allocated, but is instead like unallocated funds; how can one decide which animal to use for each offering?

אמר ליה: התם – ו'לקח' ו'ועשה'

Rav Shimi bar Ashi said to him: As for the case of birds, this is an exception, as there is an explicit verse to this effect there: It states with regard to the owner of a bird offering: "And he shall take one he-lamb for a guilt-offering to be waved, to make atonement for him, and one tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil for a meal-offering, and a log of oil; and two turtledoves or two young pigeons, such as his means suffice for, and the one shall be a sin-offering and the other a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 14:21–22), and it later states with regard to the priest: "And he shall sacrifice one of the turtledoves, or of the young pigeons, such as his means suffice for; even such as his means suffice for, the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 14:30–31).

אמר רחמנא, אי בלקיחת בעלים אי בעשיית כהן. הכא נמי

The Merciful One thereby states that the birds are allocated and designated for their offering either by the acquisition of the owner, by designating each bird for a particular offering upon their purchase, or by the action of the priest. With regard to the ruling of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, it presents no difficulty either, as it is a special case as well. Here too, when one separates these particular animals for his naziriteship offerings,

מי מצית אמרת הדין דתטאת תקרב עולה? הכא נקבה, הכא זכר.

how can youⁿ say that this one that is for the sin-offering shall be sacrificed as a burnt-offering? Here, only a female may be sacrificed as a sin-offering, whereas here, in the case of a burnt-offering, it must be male. Therefore, it is as though he allocated each animal for a specific offering. Consequently, you cannot compare this case to that of items that are not inherently designated for a particular purpose, e.g., a blemished animal or a silver bar, as they have the status of unallocated funds.

NOTES

How can you, etc. – מי מצית וכו': The discussion indicates that Rav Shimi successfully dealt with Rav Pappa's attempt to refute this question, which means that the difficulty remains unresolved. Consequently, unblemished animals, bars, and piles of beams have the same status as unallocated funds, and some commentaries rule accordingly (Meiri). Others maintain that

Rav Pappa himself is of the opinion that Rav Hisda's *halakha* is a special decree of the Torah with regard to that issue alone, and one cannot derive from it that birds, blemished animals, and silver bars are also considered like unallocated funds (Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*).

A man shaves, etc. – **הָאִישׁ מְגַלַּח וְכוּ'** – There are two versions of this *halakha*, corresponding to the two versions of the mishna cited later (30a). According to one opinion, a son can purchase an offering with his father's money only if they were both nazirites, but he cannot do so if he became a nazirite after his father's death (Commentary on *Nazir*; Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*). Rabbeinu Azriel explains that this is because the status of inheritance applies to money separated for the purpose of an offering only if the son had some connection to the money in his father's lifetime, i.e., if he too was a nazirite. However, many commentaries read the mishna in the opposite manner, i.e., that one may not use his father's money if he and his father were nazirites at the same time, whereas he may use the money if he became a nazirite after his father's passing. The commentaries explain that if the son took a vow of naziriteship during his father's lifetime he has already incurred his own monetary obligation, whereas he can purchase an offering with his father's money if he became a nazirite after the former's death, provided that he stipulated to do so (*Tosafot*; Rabbeinu Peretz; Rosh).

Value is money – דְּמֵי הַיְיִנוּ מַעוֹת: Some commentaries ask: If it is only the value of a blemished animal that is used for an offering, why did Rav Hamnuna seek to differentiate between blemished animals and money (Rabbeinu Peretz)? Rabbeinu Peretz answers that in the case of one who set aside three types of animals, it is reasonable to assume that each was separated for a different offering. No such claim applies in the case of money, however, and therefore it can be considered unallocated.

HALAKHA

But he does not fulfill his obligation with his father's offering – **וְאֵינוּ יוֹצֵא בְּקָרְבַּן אָבִיו** – If one separated his sin-offering and subsequently died, his son may not use his offering even if he too was obligated to bring an offering for that same sin (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Shegagot* 3:3).

מתּוֹב רַב הַמְנוּנָא: וּמִי אָמְרִינָן בְּהֵמָה בְּעֵלְת מוֹס כְּסִתּוּמָה דְּמִיָּא? תָּא שְׁמַע: כִּי־צִד אָמְרוּ הָאִישׁ מְגַלַּח עַל נְזִירוֹת אָבִיו? בּוֹמֵן שְׁהִיָּה הוּא וְאָבִיו נְזִירִים, וְהַפְרִישׁ אָבִיו מַעוֹת לְנְזִירוֹתָו וּמַת, וְאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר עַל מְנַת שְׁאֲגַלַּח עַל מַעוֹת אָבִיא";

הָיוּ לוֹ מַעוֹת סְתוּמוֹת – יִפְלוּ לְנִדְבָה, הֵיטֵהָ לוֹ בְּהֵמָה מוֹפְרָשֶׁת; חֲטָאת – תְּמוֹת, עוֹלָה – תְּקַרֵּב עוֹלָה, וּשְׁלָמִים יִקְרְבוּ שְׁלָמִים. מֵאִי לָאוּ אֶפִּילוּ בְּעֵלְת מוֹס?

לֹא, תְּמִימָה. אֲבָל בְּעֵלְת מוֹס כְּסִתּוּמָה דְּמִיָּא? מֵאִי אִירִיא מַעוֹת? לִימָא: הֵיטֵהָ לוֹ בְּהֵמָה בְּעֵלְת מוֹס יִפְלוּ לְנִדְבָה!

הַכִּי נִמְי, בְּעֵלְת מוֹס לְמֵאִי קְדִישָׁא – לְדְמֵי, דְּמֵי – הַיְיִנוּ מַעוֹת.

מתּוֹב רַבָּא: "קְרָבָנוּ" – בְּקָרְבָנוּ הוּא יוֹצֵא, וְאֵינוּ יוֹצֵא בְּקָרְבַּן אָבִיו. וְכוּל לֹא יוֹצֵא בְּקָרְבָנוּ שֶׁל אָבִיו שְׁהַפְרִישׁ – מִן הַחֲמוּרָה עַל הַחֲמוּרָה אוּ מִן הַחֲמוּרָה עַל הַקְּלָה.

אֲבָל יוֹצֵא בְּקָרְבַּן שְׁהַפְרִישׁ אָבִיו – מִן הַקְּלָה עַל הַקְּלָה אוּ מִן הַחֲמוּרָה עַל הַחֲמוּרָה? תְּלַמּוּד לומר "קְרָבָנוּ" "קְרָבָנוּ" – בְּקָרְבָנוּ הוּא יוֹצֵא, וְאֵינוּ יוֹצֵא בְּקָרְבָנוּ שֶׁל אָבִיו.

§ Rav Hamnuna raised an objection against Rav Nahman's statement: **And do we say that a blemished animal is considered like unallocated funds? Come and hear a proof to the contrary from the following baraita**, which begins: **How**, in what case, did the Sages say that a man shaves,^N i.e., bring the offerings sacrificed at the end of a term of naziriteship, **for his father's naziriteship?** The Gemara cites a part of that *baraita* which records a case where the son does not bring the offerings for his father's naziriteship: **When he and his father were both nazirites, and his father separated money for the offerings of his naziriteship and died, and the son said: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that I will shave, i.e., bring my offerings, through the money my father set aside, in that case he cannot shave for his father's naziriteship.**

Consequently, if the father had unallocated funds, they are allocated for communal gift offerings. If he had allocated animals, that which is for a sin-offering must be left to die, like any sin-offering whose owner has died; the animal for a burnt-offering is sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and the animal for a peace-offering is sacrificed as a peace-offering. What, is it not referring even to the case of a blemished animal, as the *baraita* differentiated only between money and animals? This indicates that a blemished animal is also considered allocated, which contradicts Rav Nahman's ruling.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: **No**; it is referring only to an unblemished animal, which is considered allocated because it is suitable for an offering itself. The Gemara asks: **However**, if that is so, is a blemished animal considered like unallocated funds? In that case, why does the *baraita* specifically distinguish between animals and unallocated funds? Let the *baraita* say as follows: If he had a blemished animal its money is allocated for communal gift offerings. The *baraita* would thereby distinguish between two similar cases that involve animals, from which one could infer the *halakha* of unallocated funds.

The Gemara answers: **So too**, this is the meaning of the *baraita*, and there is no difference between a blemished animal and money. The Gemara clarifies this claim: **For what purpose is a blemished animal consecrated?** It is for the value of its sale, and this value is provided in money.^N Consequently, this *baraita* does not refute Rav Nahman's opinion that the *halakha* of a blemished animal is like that of unallocated funds.

§ Rava also raises an objection against Rav Nahman's opinion, from a *baraita* that deals with sin-offerings. The Torah states: "And he shall bring for his offering" (Leviticus 4:23), which indicates: **He fulfills his obligation with his own offering, but he does not fulfill his obligation with his father's offering,**^M if his father was obligated to bring a sin-offering and died after separating an animal for this purpose. One might have thought that one does not fulfill his obligation with an offering that his father separated only in a case where the son's transgression is not equal in severity to that of his father's sin, e.g., sacrificing his offering from animals that his father designated to atone for a minor transgression to atone for his own major transgression, or from animals that his father designated to atone for a major transgression, to atone for his own minor transgression.

However, one might have thought that he does fulfill his obligation with an offering that his father separated if it is from animals his father set aside to atone for a minor transgression and the son atones for his own minor one, or from animals the father set aside to atone for a major transgression and the son atones for his own major one. Therefore, the verse states: "His offering" (Leviticus 4:23), and it repeats: "His offering" (Leviticus 4:28), to emphasize that he fulfills his obligation with his own offering, and he does not fulfill his obligation with his father's offering even for similar transgressions.

יכול לא יצא בקרבן אביו בבהמה שהפריש - אפילו מן הקלה על הקלה, מן החמורה על החמורה - שהרי אין אדם מגלח על בהמת אביו בנזירות, אבל יוצא במעות שהפריש אביו אפילו מן החמורה על הקלה או מן הקלה על החמורה - שהרי אדם מגלח על מעות אביו בנזירות,

The *baraita* continues: One might have thought that a son does not fulfill his obligation with his father's offering, i.e., with an animal that his father separated, even from animals that his father designated to atone for a minor transgression, to atone for the son's minor one, or from animals the father set aside to atone for a major transgression, to atone for the son's major one, as stated above, as a person cannot shave, i.e., bring an offering, for naziriteship with his father's animal. Consequently, the *halakhot* of inheritance do not apply to this animal. However, it is nevertheless possible that a son can fulfill his obligation by purchasing a sin-offering with money that his father separated for his own sin-offering, even from money the father set aside to atone for a major transgression in a case where the son is atoning for a minor transgression, or from money the father set aside to atone for a minor transgression in a case where the son is atoning for a major one, as a person can shave, i.e., purchase an offering, with the money his father set aside for naziriteship,

Perek IV

Daf 28 Amud a

HALAKHA

He separated an animal for eating forbidden fat, etc. - הפריש בהמה על החלב וכו': If one separated an animal to be brought as a sin-offering to atone for eating forbidden fat, and instead slaughtered it for the sin of consuming blood, the offering is invalid. Even if he went ahead and sacrificed it he has not gained atonement, and therefore he has not misused Temple property (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 15:6 and *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Me'ila* 4:5).

בזמן שהן סתומין, ולא בזמן שהן מפורשין? תלמוד לומר "קרבנו" - בקרבנו הוא יוצא, ואינו יוצא בקרבן אביו.

when they are unallocated and not when they are allocated. Consequently, the same should apply to one whose father separated money for a regular sin-offering, i.e., he should be able to use them for his own sin-offering. Therefore, the verse states: "His offering" (Leviticus 4:32), which serves to emphasize: He fulfills his obligation with his own offering, but he does not fulfill his obligation with the money separated for his father's offering.

יכול לא יצא במעות שהפריש, אפילו מן הקלה על הקלה מן החמורה על החמורה, אבל יוצא בקרבן שהפריש לעצמו, מן הקלה על החמורה מן החמורה על הקלה? תלמוד לומר "קרבנו... על חטאתו" - עד שהיא קרבנו לשום חטאו.

The *baraita* continues this line of argument: One might have thought that he does not fulfill his obligation with the money that his father separated if it is from money the father set aside to atone for a minor transgression and the son atones for a minor one, or from money the father set aside to atone for a major transgression and the son atones for a major one. However, the son may fulfill his obligation with the offering he separated for himself. From animals he set aside to atone for a minor transgression, he may atone for a major one, or from animals he set aside to atone for a major transgression he may atone for a minor one. Therefore, the verse states: "Then he shall bring for his offering a goat, a female without blemish, for his sin" (Leviticus 4:28), which indicates that he does not fulfill his obligation unless his offering is for the sake of his particular sin, not for some other transgression.

יכול לא יצא בבהמה שהפריש לעצמו מן הקלה על הקלה או מן החמורה על החמורה, אפילו מן הקלה על החמורה או מן החמורה על הקלה,

One might have thought that he does not fulfill his obligation with the animal he separated for himself, from animals he set aside to atone for a minor transgression to atone for a minor one; or from animals he set aside to atone for a major transgression, to atone for a major one; or even when from animals he set aside to atone for a minor transgression to atone for a major one; or from animals he set aside to atone for a major transgression to atone for a minor one.

שכן אם הפריש בהמה על החלב והביא על הדם או על הדם והביא על החלב - שהרי לא מעל ולא כיפר.

The reason is that if he separated an animal to bring as an offering for unintentionally eating forbidden fat⁴ and he instead brought that sin-offering for unintentionally consuming blood, or if he separated an animal to bring as an offering to atone for blood and instead brought it for eating forbidden fat, in that case he has not misused consecrated property, as the animal cannot lose its consecrated status. And just as it cannot lose its consecrated status, so too it cannot be redesignated to atone for a different sin, and therefore this animal also does not atone for him.