



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Nazir Daf Chuf Zayin

- The Gemara stated the opinion of Amora'im that the status of "unspecified money" applies only to actual money or to things that are easily converted to money, but not animals, metal bars, or stacks of beams. **R' Simi bar Ashi** asked **R' Pappa**, would that mean they would also hold that birds are considered to be "specified"? We have learned that **R' Chisda** said that birds only become specified at the time of purchase if specified by the owners or by the Kohanim when they are offered!? **R' Pappa** said, based on your reasoning there is a Mishna that is problematic. The Mishna says that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says that if a nazir brought 3 animals for his korbanos, without specifying which animal should be used for which korbon, the halacha is that we use the appropriate animal for each of the korbanos. Now, you have just said that animals not specified at the time of their designation are not considered to be specified. If so, how can these be offered!? **R' Simi bar Ashi** answered, regarding birds we learn from a pasuk that the designation must be either at the time of purchase or at the time of offering, which teaches that if not designated at the time of purchase they remain unspecified until the Kohen specifies them at offering. Regarding the korbanos in the Mishna it is also considered to be specified at the time of designation, because each animal is only fit for one of the korbanos (e.g. the chatas must be a female lamb, the olah must be a male lamb, and the asham must be a ram).
- **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked, how can we say that an animal with a mum is considered to be like unspecified money? A Braisa says that if a man was a nazir and he separated unspecified money for his korbanos and he then died, and his son then said "I am hereby a nazir on the condition that I can use the money set aside by my father to pay for my korbanos", he may do so. However, if they were both nezirim and the father set aside money, the son may not use the money and the money must be used to buy olos for the tzibur. Also, if he specified animals to use, the son may not use those animals. Now, presumably the Braisa is even referring to animals with a mum, and we see that they are given the status of money that was specified!? **A:** The Braisa is only discussing animals without a mum.
  - **Q:** If the Braisa means to say that an animal with a mum would be considered as unspecified money, why does the Braisa use the example of where the father left over unspecified money? Why not use the example of where the father left over an animal with a mum!? **A:** In essence that is what the Braisa is saying. An animal with a mum only has monetary kedusha – which is essentially the same as money itself.
  - **Q:** The Gemara quotes a long Braisa. The Braisa makes mention that a person cannot use the animals separated by his father for his father's nezirus, for his own nezirus. The Gemara asks, this seems to include an animal with a mum, and we see that an animal with a mum is *not* given the status of unspecified money (since a son would be allowed to use the unspecified money of his father for his own nezirus korbanos)!? **A:** The Braisa is only discussing animals without a mum.
    - **Q:** If the Braisa means to say that an animal with a mum would be considered as unspecified money, why does the Braisa use the example of where the father left over unspecified money to illustrate a case of where the son could use his father's assets for his own korbanos? Why not use the example of where the father left over an animal with a mum!? **A:** In essence that is what the Braisa is saying. An animal with a mum only has monetary kedusha – which is essentially the same as money itself.