

20 Nissan 5781
April 2, 2021



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

Halachah 4 · MISHNAH: [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 Temple.] 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. Ben Azzai said to him: This is not the method to be used (at least, by the leftover ketores). Rather (these items that are fit for communal offerings) they should set aside from them the value owed to the artisans for their wages, and they deconsecrate them by transferring their sanctity onto the money allocated for the artisans’ wages, and then they give those items (which are no longer consecrated) to the artisans as their wages. They then should repurchase those items using money from that year’s new collection of half-shekels, consecrating them for sacrificial use during the coming year.

A person consecrated all of his possessions, and among them were animals that were fitting to be used as sacrifices - male and female. 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 should fall for the upkeep of the Temple. [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 said: I prefer Rabbi Eliezer's opinion, since he was consistent in his standard (i.e., 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 explicitly (i.e., where he said, “I consecrate my animals and my possessions”),¹ but Rabbi Yehoshua was referring to a case where the person didn't specify individually.²

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 the needs of that particular kind of item, and the money can be used to offer *olah offerings*; all the other possessions shall fall to the upkeep of the Temple. (12a1 - 12a2)

GEMARA: The Mishnah teaches that there is a dispute with regard to the case of one who consecrates all his possessions, and among them there were items that are suitable for use as communal offerings. Rabbi Yochanan said: The Mishnah is referring to one whose possessions include ingredients

¹ Then we can say that he meant that everything should go to one place – for the upkeep of the Temple.

² In that case, we assume that he meant to consecrate each item for its greatest suitability.

used to prepare the incense. Rabbi Hoshayah says: If so, the Mishnah should be explained as referring specifically to an artisan of the house of Avtinah, who would receive incense as his wages.³ The Gemara asks: What is the reasoning of ben Azzai? He holds that consecrated property cannot be deconsecrated upon labor since it is intangible. Rather, it can be deconsecrated only upon a tangible object, such as money. (12a3)

Consecrating all his Possessions

The Gemara cites a *Mishnah* which contrasts the laws that pertain to items consecrated for the Temple upkeep and items designated for the Altar:

1. Unspecified consecration goes for the Temple upkeep
2. The sanctity of the Temple upkeep can take effect on all items
3. One commits *me'ilah* from that which grows from them
4. There is in them no benefit for the Kohanim

Rabbi Chananyah said: The author of that *Mishnah* is Rabbi Li'ezer, for it was taught in our *Mishnah*: A person consecrated his possessions, and among them were animals that were fitting for the Altar, 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, together with the rest of his possessions, to the upkeep of the Temple. [Evidently, R' Eliezer maintains that dedications are usually for Temple repairs, even of items that are fit for the Altar.]

Rabbi Yochanan said: The reason for Rabbi Eliezer's position is from the following verse: And if a man consecrates his

house to be holy to Hashem, [the Kohen will evaluate it]. To what case are we referring to in the verse? If you will say that this verse is referring to a dwelling place, that cannot be correct because it is already written: And if the consecrator will redeem his house. Rather, we are referring to one who, without specifying for what purpose, consecrates all his possessions. From here it is derived that unspecified consecrations are allocated for the upkeep of the Temple.

[The Gemara explains the argument between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua further.] Rabbi Ze'ira said in the name of Rabbi Churah in the name of Rav: When do they argue? They are arguing if one consecrated his (regular) possessions, however, if he consecrated just his flock, everyone (even Rabbi Eliezer) would agree that they should be brought as actual offerings.⁴ However, Rabbi Ba said in the name of Rabbi Churah in the name of Rav: When do they argue? They are arguing if one consecrated his flock, but if he consecrated general possessions, everyone (even Rabbi Yehoshua) would agree that they should fall to the upkeep of the Temple.

The Gemara asks: According to the opinion of Rabbi Ze'ira, it works out well.⁵ However, there is a difficulty with the opinion of Rabbi Ba;⁶ isn't an animal suitable for the Altar?⁷ The Gemara answers: Indeed, an animal is suitable for the Altar. Why then did this man decide to consecrate his animals without specifying that this was his intent? [Apparently, his intention was not for them to be used on the Altar;] rather, he is like one who says that these animals should be consecrated only for Temple upkeep. [There is a third opinion concerning the dispute:] Rabbi Yochanan said: There is no difference between the two cases. Both this case of one who consecrates all his possessions and that case of one who consecrates the animals in his flock are alike. In both cases, the disagreement applies. (12a3 – 12a5)

³ There is a dispute about whether the incense may be prepared by an individual in a non-sacred vessel and then dedicated to the Temple. Explaining the Mishnah as referring to an artisan who received the incense from the Temple means that the Mishnah holds true for both sides of the dispute.

⁴ Because when a person is consecrating animals that are fit for the Altar, he will not abandon the Altar, and donate for the Temple upkeep.

⁵ It is understandable that all agree that when one consecrates only animals, his intention is that they be used as offerings on the Altar, for why else would he consecrate them?

⁶ Who maintains that even in such a case Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua disagree.

⁷ Why then would Rabbi Eliezer disagree and say that the animals are consecrated for Temple upkeep?

[It was taught in the Mishnah that Rabbi Eliezer holds that animals that were consecrated for Temple upkeep are sold to those who need to bring them as offerings. What is the status of such animals after being sold?] Rav Huna said in the name of Rav that Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Animals that were consecrated for Temple upkeep that were redeemed by being sold, while still unblemished (and therefore still suitable to be used as an offering), are nevertheless transferred to non-sacred status.⁸ The Gemara cites support for this: A Mishnah said that as well: [If animals are consecrated after already having developed a blemish, only their inherent value is sanctified.] Their offspring and their milk are permitted to be used for mundane purposes after their redemption.⁹ The Gemara rejects this proof. Rav Chizkiyah said in the name of Rav Chisda: The comparison to the Mishnah should be explained as referring to a case where the animals that were consecrated for Temple upkeep were redeemed while still unblemished, but they then developed a blemish. Rabbi Yosi said in the name of Rav Chisda: The Mishnah said that as well: If animals consecrated for the Altar subsequently develop a blemish, it is prohibited to use their offspring and their milk for any mundane purpose, even after their redemption.¹⁰

[The Gemara cites support for the opposing view that even if the animal did not develop a blemish, it loses all its sanctity upon its redemption:] Rabbi Chizkiyah said in the name of Rabbi Yosi: Animals consecrated for Temple upkeep that were redeemed while still unblemished are entirely

⁸ The buyer must then consecrate the animals anew for use as offerings.

⁹ Since their sanctity is entirely removed upon their redemption. [This is in contrast to the law regarding an animal which developed a blemish after it was consecrated; upon redemption, it may only be slaughtered and eaten, but it may not be sheared or milked.] So too, the sanctity of animals that are consecrated for Temple upkeep is entirely removed upon their being redeemed, even if they are unblemished, as their sanctity inheres only in their value.

¹⁰ The Mishnah continues: However, if an animal consecrated for Temple upkeep subsequently develops a blemish, and is redeemed, it is permitted to use its offspring or milk for mundane purposes. The sanctity is fully removed only if the animal has a blemish. This implies that even animals that are consecrated for Temple upkeep retain some sanctity after redemption so long as they are unblemished.

transferred to non-sacred status; they retain no sanctity at all. This must be correct, for if you would say that they are not entirely transferred to non-sacred status (but rather, they retain some of the sanctity of their original consecration for Temple upkeep), how can the sanctity of items consecrated to the Altar take effect upon items consecrated for Temple upkeep?¹¹ [The Gemara accepts the preceding argument as compelling. Why doesn't Rav Chisda accept it. Why does he claim that it is prohibited to use for any mundane purpose animals that are redeemed before developing a blemish?] The Gemara explains: Rav Chisda holds that only animals that are blemished will become entirely non-sacred upon redemption. He holds that, by rabbinic decree, the sanctity of the Altar takes effect upon them. With regard to what matters does it take effect? With regard to the prohibition against shearing them and performing work with them.¹² (12a5 – 12b2)

It was taught in a *Baraisa*: One who set aside a female animal and consecrates it for his olah-offering, or his pesach-offering, or his asham-offering¹³ (the consecration is still effective in endowing the female animal with inherent sanctity, such that) he can make a temurah of it.¹⁴ Rabbi Shimon says: If one consecrated a female animal for his olah-offering, he can make a temurah of it; however, if he consecrated it for his pesach-offering or his asham-offering, he cannot make a temurah of it. Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah said in the name of Rabbi Shimon: In all cases, whether one consecrated it for his olah-offering, or for his pesach-

¹¹ In the Mishnah, Rabbi Eliezer rules that when an unblemished animal consecrated for Temple upkeep is redeemed by being sold, the buyers may consecrate the animals to the Altar. But if the animals still retain the sanctity of Temple maintenance, this would not be possible, due to the principle that one may not change the status of an item from one type of consecrated status to another. It is evident that all their sanctity is removed upon redemption, despite the fact that they are still unblemished.

¹² However, he agrees that Biblically, they have no sanctity of the Altar, since they were not consecrated for that purpose. Therefore, their sanctity is removed entirely upon redemption.

¹³ Although these offerings may be brought only from a male animal.

¹⁴ If he tries to substitute another animal in place of the first, both animals are consecrated.

offering, or for his asham-offering, he cannot make a temurah of it.

[The Gemara explains the basis for the different opinions in the *Baraisa*:] Rabbi Yochanan said: The reason for the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, cited anonymously, is that we find a case in which a female bird is valid to be brought as an olah-offering.¹⁵ And Rabbi Yochanan said: The reason for the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah in the name of Rabbi Shimon is based on the following *kal vachomer* argument: If (an unfit) animal of the same kind as a fit animal is distinct from the fit animal and does not attain physical sanctity, then all the more so in the case of an unfit animal of a different kind as a fit animal¹⁶ is distinct from the fit animal and does not attain physical sanctity. What is the case of (an unfit) animal of the same kind as a fit animal that is distinct from the fit animal and does not attain physical sanctity? Like that which was taught in a *Baraisa*: With regard to one who is obligated to sacrifice an asham-offering from an animal within its first year and brings an animal that was within its second year, or one who is obligated to sacrifice an asham-offering from an animal that was within its second year and brings an animal that was within its first year, he does not fulfill his obligation.¹⁷

Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Shimon (as cited by Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah), and Rabbi Yehoshua (in the Mishnah), both said the same thing. Just as Rabbi Yehoshua said that a female animal sanctified as an olah is not consecrated with inherent sanctity as an olah-offering, but rather it is consecrated only with monetary sanctity,¹⁸ so too, Rabbi

¹⁵ It is therefore evident that sanctity of an olah-offering can be applied to a female animal, and consequently, a temurah can be made from it. However, this is not true with regard to a pesach-offering or an asham-offering, which are never brought from a female animal.

¹⁶ I.e., a female animal, where only a male animal is fit.

¹⁷ In the first case, the animal is endowed with sanctity. However, in the second case, the animal remains non-sacred, despite the fact that the two animals are of the same kind and are distinct only in regard to one detail, their age.

¹⁸ This refers to the case where he consecrated all his possessions and he did not specify any purpose, the law is that the males should be brought as *olah* offerings, and the females should be sold to be offered

Shimon said that a female animal that was consecrated to be brought as a olah-offering is not consecrated with inherent sanctity as an olah-offering, but rather it is consecrated only with monetary sanctity, for if you would say that it (the female animal sanctified as an olah offering) should attain physical sanctity, then it should be left to graze until it develops a blemish! (12b2 – 12b3)

The Gemara cites the remainder of the *Baraisa* already cited above: Rebbe said: I do not see the statement of Rabbi Shimon as correct with regard to a female animal consecrated for a pesach-offering.¹⁹ I disagree, because a surplus pesach-offering²⁰ is brought as a shelamim-offering.²¹ But, the Gemara asks, according to this reasoning, let Rebbe also say: I do not see the statement of Rabbi Shimon with regard to a female animal consecrated for an asham-offering as correct;²² based on Rebbe's reasoning in the case of a pesach-offering, he should also disagree here, since a surplus asham-offering²³ is brought as an olah-offering, and as Rabbi Shimon himself explained that the consecration of a female animal for an olah-offering takes effect. Rabbi Avin answered: [Rebbe's argument for a pesach-offering does not extend to an asham-offering, because there is a crucial distinction between the cases:] If one consecrates an animal as a pesach-offering, and it is not used as such, and it is therefore brought as a shelamim-offering, the animal itself is sacrificed as a shelamim-offering. However, if one consecrates an animal as an asham-offering, and it is not

as *shelamim*, and the money from the sale should be used to purchase olah offerings.

¹⁹ Rabbi Shimon said that the animal does not attain any sanctity, since a pesach-offering is brought only from male animals.

²⁰ A pesach-offering that was not slaughtered on Pesach.

²¹ Which can be brought from female animals. It is therefore appropriate for the consecration for a pesach-offering to take effect upon a female animal and endow it with inherent sanctity, in a manner similar to Rabbi Shimon's own argument concerning an olah-offering.

²² Rabbi Shimon said that the animal does not attain any sanctity, since an asham-offering is brought only from male animals.

²³ An asham-offering that was not sacrificed as such because its owner achieved atonement with a different asham-offering.



used as such, and it is therefore brought as an olah-offering, the animal itself is not sacrificed as an olah-offering.²⁴

What is behind this disagreement between Rebbe and Rabbi Shimon concerning a female animal consecrated as a pesach-offering? This one, Rabbi Shimon, says: Surely he consecrated the animal only with monetary sanctity.²⁵ And this one, Rebbe, says: [We do not make that assumption.] Rather, he consecrated the animal to have inherent sanctity.²⁶ (12b3 – 12b4)

[Rabbi Yehoshua taught in the Mishnah that if one consecrates his possessions without specifying for what purpose, the male animals are endowed with the sanctity of olah-offerings.] Rabbi Ze'ira said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: The source for Rabbi Yehoshua's opinion is: Speak to Aaron, and to his sons, and to all the children of Israel, and say to them: Any man of the house of Israel etc. that brings his offering ... to Hashem as an olah-offering. The verse is taken to mean that all consecrated items that can be brought upon the Altar are consecrated to be sacrificed as olah-offerings (unless otherwise specified). The next verse states: That may be favorable for you, it must be without blemish, male etc.²⁷ From where is it derived that even females that are consecrated without a specific purpose are also endowed with the sanctity of an olah-offering? The continuation of the verse states: From the cattle, which is a general term that comes to include females. Rabbi Yitzchak, son of Rabbi Elazar, asked: Although it is explicitly written "male," you said that the phrase "from the cattle" comes to include females? If this is true, then in a similar manner, one could make the following claim: Although it is explicitly written "without blemish," you could say that the phrase

"from the cattle" comes to include blemished animals. For what is the difference between them?²⁸ Rav said: The difference between them is so clear it is as if the weaver's shed-stick is between them.²⁹ (12b4 – 12b5)

[The Mishnah teaches: In the case of one who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, and among them are wines, oils, and birds, which are suitable to be sacrificed on the Altar, Rabbi Eliezer says: They are sold for the needs of that kind of item, i.e., to individuals who will use them as such, and the proceeds are used to purchase olah-offerings.] Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: The source of Rabbi Eliezer's opinion is: Speak to Aaron, and to his sons, etc. that are brought to Hashem as an olah-offering. The verse is taken to mean that all animals that are consecrated are brought as olah-offerings, unless otherwise specified. The next verse states: That may be favorable for you, it must be without blemish, male etc. I might have thought this verse teaches that an unspecified consecration can be fulfilled even with olah birds. To reject this possibility, the continuation of the verse states: From the cattle, which includes only animal olos and not birds. Rabbi Yirmiyah and Rabbi Bun bar Chiya were sitting and they said: There, in explanation of the *Baraisa* cited above concerning one who consecrated a female animal for an olah-offering, Rabbi Yochanan said that the reason for the anonymously reported Rabbi Shimon's opinion, that the female is consecrated with the inherent sanctity of an olah-offering is that there is that there is a case of a female bird that is valid to be brought as a olah-offering. Yet here, in this case concerning the consecration of a female bird itself, Rabbi Eliezer said this.³⁰ The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yosi said: I established Rabbi Eliezer's opinion as being

²⁴ Rather, it is left until it develops a blemish, then it is sold, and the proceeds are used for the purchase of an olah offering.

²⁵ Since he knows that it cannot actually be brought as a pesach-offering.

²⁶ And it takes effect because a surplus pesach-offering can be brought as a shelamim-offering.

²⁷ This verse would seem to limit to male animals the principle learned in the preceding verse, but not female animals.

²⁸ Why should one assume that the phrase "from the cattle" includes only female animals but not blemished animals?

²⁹ Female animals are suitable to be brought on the Altar in some form, whereas blemished animals are never suitable to be brought on the Altar.

³⁰ Presumably, Rabbi Eliezer agrees with Rabbi Yochanan's explanation of Rabbi Shimon's opinion. If the argument for a female animal gaining inherent sanctity when consecrated for an olah-offering is based on a case of a female bird, how can it be that when a bird itself is consecrated it does not attain inherent sanctity and can therefore be sold?

in accordance with that which Rabbi Shmuel said in the name of Rabbi Ze'ira: Anything that cannot be sacrificed on the Altar, neither itself nor its monetary value, as it cannot be redeemed, is consecrated only with monetary sanctity. And therefore, you, Rabbi Eliezer, said correctly: You are not able to sacrifice this bird on the Altar, as it is written: From the cattle, and not birds. You are not able to redeem the bird were it to have inherent sanctity, as there is no concept of redemption for birds. Therefore, you must say that it is consecrated only with monetary sanctity.

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 Rabbi, who agreed with Rabbi Shimon.

He explains that our dispute depends on a dispute in a Mishnah 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.