

26 Mar Cheshvan 5774  
Oct. 30, 2013



Shekalim Daf 12

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***The distribution of one's possessions after he donated them***

The Mishna discusses at length what to do in a case where someone consecrated all his possessions, and amongst those possessions were some items that were fit for specific purposes in the Beis Hamikdosh. (12a1)

#### ***Ketores***

If one consecrated all his possessions, and amongst those possessions were some items that were fit for communal offerings, they shall be given to the Temple craftsmen as wages; these are the words of Rabbi Akiva. [If those items included the Ketores (this is Rabbi Yochanan's interpretation in the Gemora), Rabbi Akiva holds that the money should be used to pay the craftsmen who produce the Ketores. (Rabbi Akiva's opinion is that Hekdesh can be redeemed onto labor.)] Ben Azzai disagrees and says that since Hekdesh cannot be redeemed onto labor, it has to be first redeemed onto the coins that will go to the craftsmen, and only then can they receive it. (12a1)

#### ***Animals***

A person dedicated all of his possessions to *hekdesh*, and among them were male and female animals that were fitting to be used as sacrifices. Rabbi Eliezer says: The males should be sold to be brought as *olah* offerings, and the females should be sold to be offered as *shelamim*, and the money from the sale goes to the Temple repairs along with the rest of his possessions. [R' Eliezer maintains that dedications are usually for Temple repairs, even of things that are fit for the altar. Nevertheless, the law is that whatever is suitable for the altar must be offered to the altar.] Rabbi Yehoshua says: The males themselves should be brought as *olah* offerings, and the females should be sold to people who will offer them as *shelamim*. The money from the sale should be used to buy *olah* offerings. The other possessions are *hekdesh*. [R' Yehoshua holds that one does not ignore animals fit for the altar and dedicate them for Temple repairs. Consequently, we assume that they were dedicated for the altar and they themselves are offered up.]

Rabbi Akiva preferred Rabbi Eliezer's opinion, since according to him both males and females are sold, unlike Rabbi Yehoshua whose opinion is “split” as to what to do with the male and female animals. Rabbi Papayis said that both opinions are valid. Rabbi Eliezer's opinion is true when the individual consecrated his possessions while specifying a cause, then we can say that he meant that everything should

go to Hekdesh, but Rabbi Yehoshua was referring to a case where the person didn't specify at all the cause of the donation, so we can assume that he meant that each animal should be brought as its appropriate korban. (12a1 – 12a2)

### ***Wine, flour, and oil***

If a person consecrated his possessions, and among them were things suitable for offerings for the Altar, such as wines, oils and birds, Rabbi Eliezer says that they should be sold for similar items, and the money can be used to offer *olah offerings*; all the other possessions will go to the upkeep of the Temple. (12a2)

### ***Consecrating all his Possessions***

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* (in Temurah) which contrasts consecrated items designated as a sacrifice and those designated for the maintenance fund of the Temple.

Consecrating for the maintenance fund:

1. Is the default type assumed for unspecified consecration
2. Can take effect on all items
3. Makes one is liable for *me'ilah* – misuse on items that grow from it
4. Doesn't give the ones who consecrated any benefit

Rabbi Chanina said: The author of that *Mishna* is Rabbi Eliezer, for it was taught in our *Mishna*: A person dedicated all of his possessions to *hekdesh*, and among them were male and female animals that were fitting to be used as sacrifices. Rabbi Eliezer

says: The males should be sold to be brought as *olah* offerings, and the females should be sold to be offered as *shelamim*, and the money from the sale goes to the Temple repairs along with the rest of his possessions. [Evidently, R' Eliezer maintains that dedications are usually for Temple repairs, even of things that are fit for the altar.]

Rabbi Yochanan cites a verse which supports Rabbi Eliezer's position that unspecified consecration goes to the upkeep of the Temple.

The *Gemora* explains the argument between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua further. Rabbi Zeira feels that they're only arguing if one consecrated his (regular) possessions. However, if he consecrated his herd of animals, surely Rabbi Eliezer would agree that they should be brought as actual offerings. However, Rabbi Ba says that the argument is about the herd, but if he consecrated general possessions, all agree that they should go to the upkeep of the Temple.

The *Gemora* asks: How can this be? Aren't all animals (of Hekdesh) fit for the Altar? How can there be an argument, and Rabbi Eliezer holds that one who consecrated his animals, they should go to the upkeep of the Temple, instead of being offered as a korban?

The *Gemora* interprets the donor's "silence" (the fact that he did not specify his intent) to mean that they should indeed go to the upkeep of the Temple. Otherwise, he would have verbally specified where they should go to.

The third opinion is that of Rabbi Yochanan, who holds that the dispute is regarding both types of consecrations. (12a3 – 12a5)

### ***Redeeming animals from the Temple upkeep before they develop a blemish***

Rabbi Yochanan said a statement that needs much clarification. “If one redeemed Temple-upkeep animals *temimim* (i.e., without a *mum* – blemish), their sanctity is transferred to *chullin*.”

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* to support this: [All consecrated animals which had contracted a permanent physical blemish before they were consecrated and have been redeemed revert to *chullin*] and after they have been redeemed, their offspring and their milk are permitted.

Rav Chizkiyah in the name of Rav Chisda disagrees with the proof, for it is only when those Temple-upkeep animals were redeemed unblemished and later developed a blemish (but if they are still unblemished they do not become *chullin*).

Rabbi Yosi proves this distinction from a *Mishna* which states that after they have been redeemed, their offspring and their milk are prohibited.

Rabbi Chizkiyah in the name of Rabbi Yosi said: If one redeemed Temple-upkeep animals unblemished, their sanctity is transferred to *chullin*, for if you would say that they do not become unconsecrated, how can the sanctity of the altar take effect upon a Temple-upkeep sanctity.

The *Gemora* notes that they need to develop a blemish (before they are permitted for use) and then the sanctity of the Altar will take effect upon it (at least on a Rabbinical level). This is for the prohibition of shearing and working with it. (12a5 – 12b2)

### ***Further halachos concerning male and female animals***

There's a three-way dispute regarding the validity of female animals that were brought for the purpose of a male only korban. If the animal is valid that it is subject to the prohibition of *temurah* – swapping consecrated animals.

The Chachamim hold that the female animal is valid for all three types of korbanos: Olah, Pesach, and Asham.

Rabbi Shimon says that only an Olah is valid. Rabbi Yochanan explains that since a female bird is valid for an Olah, so too here with an animal. Rebbi says that he prefers Rabbi Shimon's opinion.

Thirdly, Rabbi Shimon Ben Yehuda says that none of them are valid. Again Rabbi Yochanan explains that the reason is that if a person mistakenly brought a two-year old *Asham* (used for a theft *Asham* or a *Shifcha Charufa Asham*) for a one-year old (used for a Nozir and a Metzora), he has not discharged his obligation. Rabbi Yochanan reasons that if one has not discharged his obligation in the same species (just a different age), certainly he has not discharged his obligation if he switched the genders.

## ***Hekdesh has the “Upper Hand”***

The Mishna tells us that once every thirty days Beis Din would assess the value of wine, flour, and oil, and set the price for Hekdesh's suppliers accordingly. If a person committed to supply the goods at a certain price, but later that month the price went up, he would still have to supply the same amount he committed to. Conversely, if the price went down, he would be obligated to supply the same **amount** of the higher rate, but with the lower price. Similarly, if the wood that was supplied was consumed by worms, or the wine that was supplied turned into vinegar, the supplier would have to resupply those goods, since Hekdesh has the upper hand.

The Mishna concludes that the supplier wouldn't be paid until the korbanos were brought with a 100% satisfaction (I.e., all the halachos were met), even if it meant that he would have to supply the material numerous times. Rabbi Shimon in a braisa disagrees, and says that since the Kohanim are very quick to do their service, therefore the material never spoiled, as it was immediately used for the korban

## **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

The Rambam (Hilchos *Temurah* 1:21) rules like the Chachomim in the three-way dispute we brought above. But the Sfas Emes has a difficult time understanding this, since the Rambam should rule like Rebbi, who agreed with Rabbi Shimon.

He explains that our dispute depends on a dispute in a Mishna in Maseches Teruma (19b) where the

Tannaim differ about what to do if a female animal was consecrated towards an *Asham*. The Chachomim say that this animal should graze until it receives a blemish (rendering it improper for a korban), and then it can be sold as chulin. Those funds will now be used to purchase a new male animal for that *Asham*. Rabbi Shimon disagrees, and says that the animal can be sold immediately, even without a blemish.

It is this Rabbi Shimon that the Rambam rules like. Since the same animal can be sold, it must be that it is subject to *Temurah* as well.

## **DAILY MASHAL**

### ***Power of Speech***

Why did a man consecrate his flock without specifying it was for the altar? We can assume it was for Temple up-keep.

We see that we are able to “create” sanctity of an animal merely by calling it Kodesh through our power of speech.

Daf Digest cites a Bris Avraham, who says: This same power of speech can be used for consecrating ourselves to holy activities.

They continue in the name of the Chazon Ish: Life and death are in the hands of the tongue. This refers to not only lashon hara or the ‘stab in the back’ negative expressions that can harm, but even good, supportive and congratulatory words can save a life and help a person get on the right track.