

הותירו שעורים, על דעתיה דשמואל:  
אם עולה נפדיית לא כל שכן חטאת,

The Gemara raises a similar issue: If goats that were set aside for communal sin-offerings were left over at the end of the year, according to Shmuel they may be redeemed in their unblemished state. If a burnt-offering may be redeemed unblemished, all the more so it should be permitted to redeem an animal set aside as a sin-offering. With regard to an animal set aside for a burnt-offering, if it was not redeemed in its unblemished state, but became blemished and was subsequently redeemed, the funds used for its redemption would go to purchase another burnt-offering for the repletion of the altar. The value set aside as burnt-offering thus would remain dedicated to that purpose. In the parallel case of a sin-offering, the funds used to redeem a blemished leftover communal sin-offering did not go to the purchase of a new sin-offering but to the purchase of a burnt-offering for the repletion of the altar as well. Since the animal's sanctification as a sin-offering is effectively nullified in any case, it is easier in such a case to be lenient and permit the redemption of the animal even before it has become blemished.

על דעתיה דרבי יוחנן, אמר רבי  
זעירא: רעו.

Rabbi Ze'eira said in accordance with Rabbi Yohanan's opinion: Even in the case of leftover communal sin-offerings, the animals must graze until they develop a blemish; only then may they be redeemed. The funds used to redeem the animals became sanctified and were allocated for the purchase of burnt-offerings for the repletion of the altar.

אמר רבי שמואל בר רב יצחק:  
מקייצין בהן את המזבח.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Yitzhak said: They, i.e., the leftover sin-offerings, are themselves used as burnt offerings to replete the altar without being redeemed.

וקשיא: יש חטאת שקריבה עולה?  
אמר רבי יוסה: שנייא היא, שאין  
קרבנות צבור נקבעין אלא בשחיטה.  
אמר רבי חייא: תנאי בית דין הוא על  
המותר שיקרבו עולות.

The Gemara asks: But this is difficult: Is there a sin-offering that may be brought as a burnt-offering? Rabbi Yosei said: This case is different, as it is dealing with a communal offering; communal offerings are designated as a particular type of offering only with their slaughter, and not when they are consecrated in the first place. Rabbi Hiyya offers a different explanation and says: It is a condition of the court, which stipulates with regard to remaining animals that even if they have been set aside as communal sin-offerings they may be sacrificed as burnt offerings.

#### Perek IV

#### Daf 12 Amud a

הלכה ד מתני' המקדיש נכסיו  
והיו בהן דברים ראויין לקרבנות  
הצבור –

**HALAKHA 4 • MISHNA** One who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, his possessions are consecrated for Temple maintenance. And if among them there are items that are suitable for use as communal offerings,<sup>h</sup> which may not be used for the maintenance of the Temple but only for sacrificial purposes, what is done with those items to remove their consecration for Temple maintenance, in order that they may be reconsecrated for sacrificial use?

#### HALAKHA

One who consecrates his possessions and among them there are items suitable for communal offerings – המקדיש נכסיו והיו בהן דברים ראויין לקרבנות הצבור: When someone consecrates all his possessions, without specifying for what purpose, and incense or one of its ingredients is among them, these should

be given to the Temple artisans as their wages in a procedure like that performed with the leftover incense (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 5:10). This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, as explained by Rabbi Yohanan later in the Gemara.

One who consecrates all his possessions, and among them there is an animal that is suitable to be sacrificed on the altar – **המקדיש נכסיו והיה בהן בהמה** – **ראויה על גבי מזבח**: If one consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, and among them there are unblemished animals suitable for sacrificing on the altar, they are to be sold. The males are sold for the needs of burnt-offerings and then sacrificed as such. The females are sold for the needs of peace-offerings and then sacrificed as such. The money received in the sale goes to Temple maintenance, in accordance with the *halakha* that unspecified consecrated items are for Temple maintenance (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramin* 5:7, 6:1). This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua.

ינתנו לאומנין בשכרן, דברי רבי עקיבא. אמר לו בן עזאי: אינה היא המדה. אלא, מפרישין מהן שכר האומנים, ומחללין אותן על מעות האומנין, ונותנים אותן לאומנין בשכרן, וחוזרין ולקחים אותה מתרומה חדשה.

They are given to Temple artisans as their wages,<sup>n</sup> and thereby they are desacralized;<sup>n</sup> this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Ben Azzai said to him: This is not the method to be used. Rather, the same method that is used to desacralize the leftover incense, as is described in the previous mishna, should also be used here, i.e., they set aside from the consecrated items the equivalent of the value owed to the artisans for their wages, and they desacralize 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. According to both opinions, once the desacralized items are in the possession of the artisans, one of Temple treasurers should repurchase those items using money from that year's new collection of half-shekels, consecrating them for sacrificial use during the coming year.

המקדיש נכסיו והיה בהן בהמה ראויה על גבי מזבח, זכרים ונקבות.

In the case of one who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, and among them there is an animal that is suitable to be sacrificed on the altar,<sup>h</sup> male or female, what should be done with it?

רבי אליעזר אומר: זכרים ומכרו לצרכי עולות, ונקבות ומכרו לצרכי זבחי שלמים, ודמיהן יפלו עם שאר נכסיו לבדק הבית.

Rabbi Eliezer says: Since he did not specify otherwise, everything is consecrated for Temple maintenance. Therefore, any males should be sold for the needs of burnt-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such. And any females, since they cannot be brought as burnt-offerings, should be sold for the needs of peace-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such. And their monetary value that is received from their sale is allocated with the rest of his property for Temple maintenance.

רבי יהושע אומר: זכרים עצמן יקרבו עולות, ונקבות ומכרו לצרכי זבחי שלמים, ויביא בדמיהן עולות.

Rabbi Yehoshua says: Although he did not specify for what purpose he consecrated his possessions, it may be assumed that he intended the animals to be consecrated as burnt-offerings. Therefore, any males should themselves be sacrificed as burnt-offerings, and any females, since they cannot be brought as burnt-offerings, should be sold for the needs of peace-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such, and their monetary value that is received from their sale should be used to purchase and bring burnt-offerings.

ושאר נכסים יפלו לבדק הבית.

According to both opinions, the rest of the possessions, which are not suitable for sacrificial use, are allocated for Temple maintenance.

אמר רבי עקיבא: רואה אני את דברי רבי אליעזר מדברי רבי יהושע, שרבי אליעזר השווה את מדותיו ורבי יהושע חלק.

Rabbi Akiva said: I see the statement of Rabbi Eliezer as more correct than the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua, since Rabbi Eliezer applied his method equally to both animals and other possessions in treating both as consecrated for Temple maintenance, whereas Rabbi Yehoshua made a distinction between them.<sup>n</sup>

NOTES

ינתנו לאומנין – They are given to artisans as their wages, etc. – בשכרן וכו': It is not possible to desacralize these items directly by redeeming them with money from the Temple treasury. In order to desacralize an item, its sanctity must be transferred to a non-sacred item, and the money in the Temple treasury was itself consecrated (*Melekheth Shlomo*, citing Rabbi Suleiman).

To artisans as their wages, and thereby they are desacralized – לאומנין בשכרן: According to Rabbi Akiva, artisans who worked for the Temple could be paid with money that had been consecrated for Temple maintenance. Upon paying the artisans, the money became desacralized. Just as sanctity can be transferred to a non-sacred physical object, it can also be transferred to the labor the artisans invested in the Temple, despite the fact that labor is intangible. This is derived from the verse: "And they shall make Me a Temple" (Exodus 25:8), which implies that the labor itself is also to be funded from the Temple treasury (*Tosafot* on *Temura* 31b). Ben Azzai argues that since the labor is intangible, sanctity cannot be transferred to it. As such, the artisans' wages had to be paid from non-sacred funds. As the mishna states, according to ben Azzai, the money set aside for the artisans' wages must be non-sacred from the outset. The Temple treasurers ac-

quired these funds as follows: Structures built at the behest of the Temple treasury were not consecrated directly. Rather, once completed, they were consecrated by transferring the sanctity of consecrated money from the Temple treasury onto the structure. That money was then desacralized and it was permitted to use it to pay the artisans. Or, as ben Azzai suggested, the sanctity of the consecrated animals could be transferred onto the money, which would in turn desacralize the animals. The animals would then be given to the artisans as wages and subsequently bought back with funds from the new shekels, thereby deconsecrating that money and consecrating the animals as communal offerings.

Since Rabbi Eliezer applied his method equally, whereas Rabbi Yehoshua made a distinction – שרבי אליעזר השווה את מדותיו – ורבי יהושע חלק: Some explain that Rabbi Akiva was bothered by the fact that Rabbi Yehoshua differentiated between the consecration of animals and other possessions (Rambam; Rabeinu Meshulam). Others explain that Rabbi Akiva was bothered by Rabbi Yehoshua's distinction between male and female animals, whereas Rabbi Eliezer applied the same method for both genders (Rash Sirilio).

Papeyyas – פפייס: From the Greek Παππίας, *pappias*, based on the word father, grandfather, or priest. Although there is a Hebrew name with a similar meaning, Sheariah, mentioned in I Chronicles 8:38, it is possible that Papeyyas is just a form of the Roman name Pappus.

## PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Papeyyas – רבי פפייס: Rabbi Papeyyas is mentioned among the Sages of the academy of Yavne during the generation of the destruction of the Temple. It seems that he was younger than Rabbi Yehoshua. A number of his testimonies as well as some of his statements of *halakha* and *aggada* are found in the mishna and other sources. Not much is known about his life or his offspring.

## HALAKHA

One who consecrates all his possessions, and among them there were items that are suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, such as wines, and oils, and birds – המקדיש – נכסיו והיו בהן דברים ראויים לנבית: If one consecrated all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, and among them were wine, oil, and fine flour that are suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, these are sold for the needs of that kind, and then they are sacrificed by the buyer. The money received from the sale is used to purchase male animals, which are sacrificed as burnt-offerings (Rambam *Sefer Hafl'a'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramin* 5:8). This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as Rabbi Akiva stated that he prefers the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer over that of Rabbi Yehoshua. Furthermore, although Rabbi Papeyyas disagrees, there is a principle that the *halakha* is in accordance with Rabbi Akiva in disagreements with a colleague.

That unspecified consecrated items are consecrated for Temple maintenance – שפתם הקדשות לבדק הבית: If one consecrates his possessions without specifying for what purpose, they are consecrated for Temple maintenance. If among them there are animals that are suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, these animals are sold to be sacrificed as appropriate: The males are sold to be used as burnt-offerings and the females are sold to be used as peace-offerings. The money from the sale goes to Temple maintenance. (Rambam *Sefer Hafl'a'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramin* 5:7, 6:1).

One violates the prohibition against misuse of consecrated objects by deriving benefit from that which grows from items consecrated for Temple maintenance – ומועילין בגידוליהן: If one derives benefit from that which grows from consecrated objects, he violates the prohibition against misuse of consecrated objects. How? If one who consecrates a field or tree and subsequently derives benefit from its grass or fruit, he is in violation of misuse of consecrated objects (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Me'ila* 5:6). This is in accordance with the mishna in *Temura* 13a.

אמר רבי פפייס: שמעתי את דברי שניהן, המקדיש בפירוש – כדברי רבי אליעזר, והמקדיש סתם – כדברי רבי יהושע.

Rabbi Papeyyas<sup>LP</sup> said: I heard the statements of both of them applied to different situations: **One who consecrates** all his possessions and **explicitly** states that his animals are to be included, clearly intends to equate his animals with the rest of his possessions, that both should be consecrated for the same purpose, i.e., for Temple maintenance. Therefore, he should act in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. However, with regard to **one who consecrates** all his possessions **without explicitly specifying** that this includes his animals, since there is no reason to presume that he wishes them all to be consecrated for the same purpose, it is presumed that each item is consecrated for the purpose most suited to it. Therefore, he should act in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua.

המקדיש נכסיו והיו בהן דברים ראויים לנבית מנחת, ינות ושמן ועופות. רבי אליעזר אומר: ימכרו לצרכי אותו המין, ויביא בדמיהן עולות, ושאר נכסים יפלו לבדק הבית.

In the case of **one who consecrates** all his possessions, and among them there were items that are suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, such as wines for libations, and oils for meal-offerings, and birds,<sup>H</sup> e.g., turtledoves or young pigeons, 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 he should bring with their monetary value that is received from their sale burnt-offerings. And the rest of the possessions are allocated for Temple maintenance.**

גמ' "המקדיש וכו' לקרבנות צבור". רבי יוחנן אומר: קטורת. אמר רבי הושעיה: תיפתר באומן משל בית אבטינס, שהיה נוטל בשכרו קטורת.

**GEMARA** The mishna 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 Yohanan said:** The mishna is referring to one whose possessions include ingredients used to prepare the **incense**. **Rabbi Hoshaya says:** If so, the mishna should be explained as referring specifically to an artisan of the house of Avtinas, who would receive incense as his wages. 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 mishna as referring to an artisan who received the incense from the Temple means that the mishna holds true for both sides of the dispute.

מה טעמא דבן עזאי – שאין ההקדש מתחיל על המלאכה אלא על המעות.

**S** The mishna teaches that Rabbi Akiva holds that incense consecrated for Temple maintenance may be desacralized simply by giving it to the artisans as their wages, but ben Azzai insisted the incense must be desacralized by transferring its sanctity to money. The Gemara asks: **What is the reasoning of ben Azzai?** He holds that **consecrated property cannot be desacralized upon labor** since it is intangible. **Rather**, it can be desacralized only upon a tangible object, such as **money**.

תמן תנינן: יש בקדשי בדק הבית –

The Gemara notes: **We learned** in a mishna **there** (*Temura* 31b): **There are certain halakhot** that apply to **items consecrated for Temple maintenance** that do not apply to animals consecrated for the altar. They are:

שפתם הקדשות לבדק הבית, הקדש בדק הבית – חל על הכל, ומועילין בגידוליהן, ואין בהן הנגיה לכהנים.

**That unspecified consecrated items are consecrated for Temple maintenance.**<sup>H</sup>

**Consecration for Temple maintenance takes effect on all types of objects**, even wood, stones, and blemished animals; while consecration for the altar takes effect only on objects that may be brought as offerings upon the altar.

**One** violates the prohibition against **misuse** of consecrated objects by deriving benefit from that which grows from items consecrated for Temple maintenance,<sup>H</sup> such as an egg of a chicken or milk of a domesticated animal. **One who derives benefit is liable to pay a fifth of the principle amount in addition to sacrificing the relevant guilt-offering.**

**And unlike** with animals consecrated to the altar, **there is no benefit from them for the priests**. Priests sometimes benefit from animals consecrated to the altar by eating portions of the offerings or receiving their hides.

NOTES

It is already written: "And if the one who consecrated it will redeem his house," etc. – ואם המקדיש – וגאל את ביתו וכו' The Gemara assumes that "his house" mentioned in this verse in fact refers to his house. That assumption makes superfluous the phrase "his house" in the previous verse. Since it would be superfluous if understood literally, the Gemara interprets "his house" in the first verse as not referring specifically to a house, but to the entirety of one's possessions, although that includes items that are suitable to be brought on the altar (*Shiklei Yosef*; Vilna Gaon; *Malbim*; *Asirif HaEifa on Torat Kohanim, Behukotai 4:9*).

HALAKHA

Both this case of one who consecrates all his possessions and that case of one who consecrates the animals in his flock are alike – היא המקדיש נכסיו היא המקדיש עדרו – If one consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose or consecrates an animal without specifying for what purpose, the male unblemished animals are sold for the needs of burnt-offerings and are sacrificed as such by the buyers. The females are sold for the needs of peace-offerings and are sacrificed as such by the buyers. The money received in their stead, like all unspecified consecrated objects, is for Temple maintenance (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramin 5:7*). This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as Rabbi Yohanan explained the disagreement.

אמר רבי חנניה: דרבי ליעור היא, דתנינן: המקדיש נכסיו והיתתה בהן בהמה ראויה על גבי מזבח זכרים ונקבות, רבי ליעור אומר: זכרים ימכרו לצרכי עולות, ונקבות ימכרו לצרכי זבחי שלמים, ודמיהן יפלו עם שאר נכסים לבדק הבית.

Rabbi Hananya said that this mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as we learned in the mishna: In the case of one who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, and there was among them an animal that is suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, whether males or females, Rabbi Eliezer says: Any males should be sold for the needs of burnt-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such; and any females, since they cannot be brought as burnt-offerings, should be sold for the needs of peace-offerings, i.e., to individuals who will sacrifice them as such. And their monetary value that is received from their sale is allocated with the rest of his property for Temple maintenance. Unlike Rabbi Yehoshua, who argues with him in the mishna, Rabbi Eliezer assumes that since he did not specify otherwise, all one's possessions, including his animals, are consecrated for Temple maintenance and must therefore be desacralized.

אמר רבי יוחנן טעמא דרבי ליעור ואיש כי יקדיש את ביתו קודש לה" במה אנו קיימין אם בבית דירה כבר כתוב ואם המקדיש יגאל את ביתו, אלא כי אנו קיימין במקדיש נכסיו, מכן שסתם הקדשות לבדק הבית.

Rabbi Yohanan said: The source for Rabbi Eliezer's opinion is the verse: "And when a man shall consecrate his house to be holy to the Lord" (Leviticus 27:14). To what case are we referring in the verse? If you suggest this verse is referring to a dwelling place, that cannot be correct because it is already written: "And if the one who consecrated it will redeem his house"<sup>N</sup> (Leviticus 27:15). Rather, we are referring to one who, without specifying for what purpose, consecrates all his possessions. From here it is derived that unspecified consecrated property is allocated for Temple maintenance.

אמר רבי זעירא רב חונה בשם רב: במה פליגין – במקדיש נכסיו, אבל במקדיש עדרו – כל עמא מודיי שהוא למזבח.

The Gemara cites differing opinions concerning which cases Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua agree and disagree upon: Rabbi Ze'eira said that Rav Huna said in the name of Rav: With regard to what case do they disagree? They disagree with regard to one who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose. However, with regard to one who consecrates the animals in his flock without specifying for what purpose, everyone agrees that they are consecrated for the altar. Since the consecration includes only items that are suitable to be sacrificed on the altar, even Rabbi Eliezer concedes that it is assumed that one consecrated them for the altar and not for Temple maintenance.

רבי בא רב חונה בשם רב: מה פליגין – במקדיש עדרו, אבל במקדיש נכסיו כל עמא מודיי שהוא לבדק הבית.

Rabbi Ba said that Rav Huna said in the name of Rav: With regard to what case do they disagree? With regard to one who consecrates the animals in his flock without specifying for what purpose. However, with regard to one who consecrates all his possessions without specifying for what purpose, including animals that are unsuitable to be sacrificed on the altar, everyone agrees that they are consecrated for Temple maintenance.

על דעתיה דרבי זעירא נחא, וקשיא על דרבי בא: בהמה לא למזבח היא! בהמה למזבח היא, ולמה סתם האיש הזה – שהוא באומר לא יהיה אלא לבדק הבית.

The Gemara asks: According to the opinion of Rabbi Ze'eira, it works out well. 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? However, there is a difficulty with the opinion of Rabbi Ba, who maintains that even in such a case Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua disagree. Isn't an animal suitable for the altar? Why then would Rabbi Eliezer disagree and say that the animals are consecrated for Temple maintenance? 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 maintenance.

רבי יוחנן אומר: לא שנייא, היא המקדיש נכסיו היא המקדיש עדרו, היא המחלוקת.

There is a third opinion concerning the dispute: Rabbi Yohanan 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.<sup>H</sup> In both cases, the disagreement applies.

רב חונה בשם רב רבי אבהו בשם  
רבי יוחנן: קדשי בְּדֵק הַבַּיִת שֶׁפֻּדְּאָן  
תְּמִימִין – יֵצְאוּ לְחֻלִּין.

It was taught in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer holds that animals that were consecrated for Temple maintenance 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 Abbahu said in the name of Rabbi Yohanan:** Animals that were **consecrated for Temple maintenance 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. The buyer must then consecrate the animals anew for use as offerings.

מתניתא אמרה כן: ולדן וחלבן מותר  
לאחר פדיון.

The Gemara brings a proof. **The mishna (Hullin 130a) said that** as well: If animals are consecrated after already having developed a blemish, only their inherent value is sanctified. Therefore, **their offspring and their milk are permitted** to be used for mundane purposes **after their redemption**, since their sanctity is entirely removed upon their redemption. So too, the sanctity of animals that are consecrated for Temple maintenance is entirely removed upon their being redeemed, even if they are unblemished, as their sanctity inheres only in their value.

Perek **IV**  
Daf **12** Amud **b**

רב חזקיה בשם רב חסדא: תפטר  
שפדאן תמימין והוממו.

The Gemara disarms this proof. **Rav Hizkiya said in the name of Rav Hisda:** The comparison to the mishna **should be explained** as referring to a case where the animals that were consecrated for Temple maintenance **were redeemed** while still **unblemished**, but they then **developed a blemish**. Once an animal has developed a blemish, its sanctity ceases to be inherent and inheres only in its monetary value. As long as the animal remains unblemished, it retains some inherent sanctity that is not removed upon redemption.

רבי יוסה בשם רב חסדא: מתניתא  
אמרה כן: ולדן וחלבן אסור לאתר  
פדיון.

**Rabbi Yosei said in the name of Rav Hisda: The mishna (Temura 31b) said that** as well: If animals consecrated for the altar subsequently develop a blemish, **it is prohibited** to use **their offspring or their milk** for any mundane purpose, even **after their redemption**. The mishna continues: However, if an animal consecrated for Temple maintenance 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 maintenance retain some sanctity after redemption so long as they are unblemished.

רבי חזקיה בשם רבי יוסה: קדשי  
בְּדֵק הַבַּיִת שֶׁפֻּדְּאָן תְּמִימִין – יֵצְאוּ  
לְחֻלִּין.

The Gemara cites support for the opposing view of Rabbi Yohanan that even if the animal did not develop a blemish, it loses all its sanctity upon its redemption: **Rabbi Hizkiya said in the name of Rabbi Yosei:** Animals consecrated for Temple maintenance that were redeemed while still **unblemished** are entirely **transferred to non-sacred** status; they retain no sanctity at all.

אין תימר לא יצאו לחולין – היאך  
קדשי מוצת חליו על קדשי בְּדֵק  
הַבַּיִת?

This must be correct, for if you say they are not entirely transferred to non-sacred status but retain some of the sanctity of their original consecration for Temple maintenance, **how can** the sanctity of items consecrated to the altar take effect upon items consecrated for Temple maintenance? In the mishna, it is clear that when an unblemished animal consecrated for Temple maintenance 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 (see *Temura* 32b). Perforce, all their sanctity is removed upon redemption, despite the fact that they are still unblemished.

One who set aside a female animal and consecrates it for his burnt-offering or his Paschal lamb or his guilt-offering – ולא שמו ולא שמו: הפריש נקבה לעולתו ולפסחו ולא שמו: Although a female animal is not suitable for a burnt-offering, or a Paschal lamb, or a guilt-offering, if one set aside a female animal and consecrated it for these types of offerings, the consecration takes effect, and he can make a substitute from it. Since they are unblemished animals, once they attain the sanctity that inheres in the item's value, they attain inherent sanctity as well (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Temura* 1:21). With regard to a burnt-offering, this ruling reflects all of the opinions in the *baraita*. With regard to a Paschal lamb and guilt-offering, this ruling is in accordance with the opinion of the first *tanna*.

One who is obligated to sacrifice a guilt-offering from an animal less than one year old and brings an animal that was two years old – אשם בן שנה והביא – בן שתיים: With regard to one who was obligated to sacrifice a sheep less than one year old and brought a sheep that was two years old, or one who was obligated to sacrifice a sheep that was two years old and sacrificed a sheep that was one year old, the offering is disqualified. The flesh is set aside until the animal becomes disqualified; it is then burnt. This ruling is in accordance with the *Tosefta Zevahim* 1:2 (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:26).

בעלי מומין קדושת המזבח חלה עליהן. ליהודה מילה? לגיזה ולעבודה.

הפריש נקבה לעולתו ולפסחו ולא שמו – עושה תמורה. רבי שמעון אומר: לעולתו עושה תמורה, לפסחו ולא שמו אינו עושה תמורה. רבי שמעון בן יהודה אומר משום רבי שמעון: לעולתו ולפסחו ולא שמו אינו עושה תמורה.

אמר רבי יוחנן: טעמא דרבי שמעון – שכן מצינו נקבה בעוף בשירה לבא עולה.

אמר רבי יוחנן: טעמא דרבי שמעון בן יהודה אם מין במינו הוא חלוק עליו – כל שכן מין בשאינו מינו.

איזהו מין במינו שהוא חלוק עליו – כהדא דתני: אשם בן שנה והביא בן שתיים, בן שתיים והביא בן שלש – לא יצא.

The Gemara accepts the preceding argument as compelling. Perforce, Rav Hisda should accept it. Why, then, 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 Hisda 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 using them for labor**. However, he agrees that according to Torah law, they have no sanctity of the altar, since they were not consecrated for that purpose. Therefore, their sanctity is removed entirely upon redemption.

It was taught in a *baraita*: **One who set aside a female animal and consecrates it for his burnt-offering, or his Paschal lamb, or his guilt-offering,**<sup>H</sup> although these offerings may be brought only from a male animal, the consecration is still effective in endowing the female animal with inherent sanctity, such that **it makes a substitute;**<sup>N</sup> if he tries to substitute another animal in place of the first, both animals are consecrated. **Rabbi Shimon says:** If one consecrated a female animal for **his burnt-offering, it makes a substitute;** however, if he consecrated it for **his Paschal lamb or his guilt-offering, it does not make a substitute.** **Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda said in the name of Rabbi Shimon:** In all cases, whether one consecrated it for **his burnt-offering, or for his Paschal lamb, or for his guilt-offering, it does not make a substitute.**

The Gemara explains the basis for the different opinions in the *baraita*: **Rabbi Yohanan said:** The reason for the opinion of **Rabbi Shimon**, as cited by the first *tanna*, is **that we find a case in which a female bird is valid to be brought as a burnt-offering.** It is therefore clear that sanctity of a burnt-offering can be applied to a female animal, and consequently, a substitute can be made from it. However, this is not true with regard to a Paschal lamb or a guilt-offering, which are never brought from a female animal.

**And Rabbi Yohanan said:** The reason for the opinion of **Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda** in the name of **Rabbi Shimon** is based on the following *a fortiori* argument: **If two animals are of the same kind, i.e., the same gender, and one is distinct from the other in a small, invalidating detail, that distinction is sufficient to prevent the animal from attaining any sanctity. This is all the more so in the case of two animals of different kinds, i.e., of different genders, which is a distinction of greater import. If being of one gender invalidates the animal, it will certainly prevent the invalid animal from attaining any sanctity.**

What is the case of two animals of the same kind, where **one is distinct from the other in a small, invalidating detail?** **Like that which was taught in a baraita:** With regard to one who is obligated to sacrifice a **guilt-offering** from an animal less than **one year old and brings an animal that was two years old,**<sup>NH</sup> or one who is obligated to sacrifice a **guilt-offering** from an animal that was **two years old and brings an animal that was three years old, he does not fulfill his obligation.** 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.

NOTES

**Substitute – תמורה:** It is prohibited by the Torah to substitute a non-sacred animal for one that has been consecrated as an offering (see Leviticus 27:9–10). One who does so is liable to receive lashes. Furthermore, if one attempts to do so, then, while the non-sacred animal is consecrated by the substitution, the original animal retains its own sanctity. One is therefore left with two consecrated animals, and the second animal is consecrated with the same type of sanctity as the original animal. This is true even in cases where the non-sacred animal is not suitable for that type of sanctity, e.g., if a female animal is substituted for a burnt-offering or any animal is substituted for a sin-offering. In those cases, the animal is either killed or left to graze, at which point it is sold to

allow the proceeds to be used for the purchase of an offering of that type of sanctity. Tractate *Temura* deals extensively with the *halakhot* governing substitution.

**One year old... two years old – בן שנה... בן שתיים:** There are six types of guilt-offerings, all of which must come from a male sheep. Usually the Torah uses the term ram to indicate this. The term ram suggests an older animal, and it is understood to mean that the animal should be at the beginning of its second year. This is true in most cases. For some kinds of offerings, such as the guilt-offering of a nazirite, the Torah uses the term sheep, and then the intention is that a male sheep less than one year old should be used.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ שְׁנֵיהֶם אָמְרוּ דְּבַר אֶחָד. כַּמָּה דְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אָמַר נִקְבָּה לְעוֹלָה לֹא קִדְּשָׁה אֲלֵא הִקְדַּשׁ דָּמִים – בֵּן דְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אָמַר: נִקְבָּה לְעוֹלָה לֹא קִדְּשָׁה אֲלֵא הִקְדַּשׁ דָּמִים. אִין תֵּימַר קִדְּשָׁה קְדוּשַׁת הַגּוֹי – יָרְעוּ.

§ Rabbi Yohanan said: Rabbi Shimon, as cited by Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda, and Rabbi Yehoshua, in the mishna, **both said the same idea.** Just as Rabbi Yehoshua said that a female animal that was consecrated without a specific purpose is **not consecrated** with inherent sanctity as a burnt-offering, but rather it is consecrated only with sanctity that inheres in the animal's monetary value, so too, Rabbi Shimon said that a female animal that was consecrated to be brought as a burnt-offering is **not consecrated** with inherent sanctity as a burnt-offering, but rather it is consecrated only with sanctity that inheres in the animal's monetary value, which is why one cannot make a substitute from it. It is clear that Rabbi Yehoshua holds that the animal does not have inherent sanctity. If you say he holds that one consecrated the female animal with inherent sanctity, then it would not be permitted to sell it for the needs of peace-offerings, as Rabbi Yehoshua indeed rules in the mishna. Rather, it should have to graze until it develops a blemish, since animals with inherent sanctity may not be sold until they develop a blemish.

אָמַר רַבִּי: [אִין] אָנִי רוֹאֶה אֶת דְּבַרִּי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בְּפֶסֶת, שֶׁהַמּוֹתֵר פְּסַח בְּאֵשׁ שְׁלָמִים.

The Gemara cites the remainder of the *baraita* already cited above: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: I do not see the statement of Rabbi Shimon as correct with regard to a female animal consecrated for a Paschal lamb. Rabbi Shimon said that the animal does not attain any sanctity, since a Paschal lamb is brought only from male animals. I disagree, because a leftover Paschal lamb, a Paschal lamb that was not slaughtered on Passover, is brought as a peace-offering, which can be brought from female animals. It is therefore appropriate for the consecration for a Paschal lamb to take effect upon a female animal and endow it with inherent sanctity, in a manner similar to Rabbi Shimon's own argument concerning a burnt-offering.

וְלִימָא אִין אָנִי רוֹאֶה דְּבַרִּי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בְּאֵשׁ שֶׁהַמּוֹתֵר אֶשֶׁם בְּאֵשׁ עוֹלָה.

But, according to this line of logic, let Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi also say: I do not see the statement of Rabbi Shimon with regard to a female animal consecrated for a guilt-offering as correct. Rabbi Shimon said that the animal does not attain any sanctity, since a guilt-offering is brought only from male animals. However, based on Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's reasoning in the case of a Paschal lamb, he should also disagree here, since a leftover guilt-offering, a guilt-offering that was not sacrificed as such because its owner achieved atonement with a different guilt-offering, is brought as a burnt-offering, and as Rabbi Shimon himself explained that the consecration of a female animal for a burnt-offering takes effect.

אָמַר רַבִּי אַבִּין: אִם הִקְדִּישׁ פְּסַח בְּאֵשׁ שְׁלָמִים – גּוֹפּוּ קֶרֶב שְׁלָמִים, אִם הִקְדִּישׁ אֶשֶׁם בְּאֵשׁ עוֹלָה – אִין גּוֹפּוּ קֶרֶב עוֹלָה.

Rabbi Avin said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's argument for a Paschal lamb does not extend to a guilt-offering, because there is a crucial distinction between the cases: If one consecrates an animal as a Paschal lamb, and it is not used as such, and it is therefore brought as a peace-offering, the animal itself is sacrificed as a peace-offering. However, if one consecrates an animal as a guilt-offering, and it is not used as such, and it is therefore brought as a burnt-offering, the animal itself is not sacrificed as a burnt-offering. Rather, it is left until it develops a blemish, then it is sold, and the proceeds are used for the purchase of a burnt offering.

מַהוּ בְּדוּן? הֲהִינּוּ אָמַר הִקְדַּשׁ דָּמִים הִקְדִּישׁ, וְהִינּוּ אָמַר – הִקְדַּשׁ גּוֹפּוּ הִקְדִּישׁ.

What is behind this disagreement between Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and Rabbi Shimon concerning a female animal consecrated as a Paschal lamb? This one, Rabbi Shimon, says: Surely he consecrated the animal only with sanctity that inheres in the animal's monetary value, since he knows that it cannot actually be brought as a Paschal lamb. And this one, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, says: We do not make that assumption. Rather, he consecrated the animal to have inherent sanctity, and it takes effect because a leftover Paschal lamb can be brought as a peace-offering.

רַבִּי זְעִירָא בִּשְׁם רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ: טַעֲמָא דְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "דְּבַר אֶל אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל בָּנָיו וְאֶל כָּל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְגו' אִשׁוּר יִקְרִיב לָהּ לְעוֹלָה" – הַבֵּל קֶרֶב לְעוֹלָה.

§ Rabbi Yehoshua taught in the mishna that if one consecrates animals without specifying for what purpose, the animals are endowed with the sanctity of burnt-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 unto them: Any man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers in Israel, that brings his offering, whether it be any of their vows, or any of their free-will offerings, which are brought to the Lord as a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 22:18). The verse is taken to mean that all vows or free-will offerings that can be brought to the Lord, i.e., animals, are consecrated to be sacrificed as burnt-offerings unless otherwise specified.

NOTES

The weaver's rod – שִׁבְטָא דְכַדְכָדָא: Many explain that the intent of this phrase is that the distinction is as obvious as the gap in the weave made by a weaver's rod, which is immediately apparent. However, others assume the exact opposite, that the gap created by the weaver's rod is very small and barely noticeable. So too, here the distinction is not immediately obvious (see *Korban HaEida*).

LANGUAGE

The weaver's rod [*shivta dekhadkada*] – שִׁבְטָא דְכַדְכָדָא: Some assume that this is the same rod mentioned in the Mishna (*Shabbat* 81a; 122b), from the Greek *κερκίς*, *kerkis*, genitive *κερκίδος*, *kerkidōs*, meaning a weaver's shuttle or any taper rod of wood, ivory, or bone, used to measure. The original form of the word appears to have been *karkad*, meaning a shuttle, or a sharp rod that is used for weaving. Sometimes it is used to refer to any type of sharp rod.

BACKGROUND

The weaver's rod – שִׁבְטָא דְכַדְכָדָא:



Shuttle, which holds the woof threads, being thrown between the warp threads

”לְרִצּוֹנְכֶם תָּמִים זָכָר.” מִנּוּן אֶפִּילוּ נִקְבָּר – תִּלְמוּד לומר “בְּבִקְרָא” לְרִבּוּת אֶת נִקְבּוֹת.

רַבִּי יִצְחָק בִּי רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר שָׂאֵל: כְּתִיב “זָכָר” וְאֵת אִמְרַת “בְּבִקְרָא” לְרִבּוּת אֶת הַנִּקְבּוֹת? וְדַקּוּתָהּ כְּתִיב “תָּמִים” וְאֵת אִמְרַת “בְּבִקְרָא” לְרִבּוּת בְּעַלֵּי מוֹמִיין? מַה בִּינְיָהוּן? רַב אָמַר: שִׁבְטָא דְכַדְכָדָא בִּינְיָהוּן.

”רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אָמַר יִמְכְרוּ כו' הַמִּין.”

רַבִּי אַבְהוּ בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לֵקִישׁ: טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר “דִּבְרֵי אֶל אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל בְּנָיו וְגו' אֲשֶׁר יִקְרִיבוּ לָהּ לְעוֹלָה” – הַכֹּל קָרַב עוֹלָה.

”לְרִצּוֹנְכֶם תָּמִים זָכָר,” יְכוּל אֶפִּילוּ עוֹפוֹת – תִּלְמוּד לומר “בְּבִקְרָא” וְלֹא עוֹפוֹת.

רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה וְרַבִּי בּוֹן בַּר חֲיִיָּה, הָווּן יִתְיָבוּן וְאָמְרוּן: תַּמָּן אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן שְׁבִין נִקְבָּה שְׁבַעוּף כְּשִׁירָה לְבָא עוֹלָה, וְכֹא אָמַר הֲבִיין!

The next verse states: “That you may be accepted, you shall sacrifice a male without blemish” (Leviticus 22:19). This verse would seem to limit to male animals the principle learned in the preceding verse. From where is it derived that even females that are consecrated without a specific purpose are also endowed with the sanctity of a burnt-offering? The continuation of the verse states: “Of the cattle” (Leviticus 22:19), which is a general term that comes to include females.

Rabbi Yitzhak, son of Rabbi Elazar, asked: Although it is explicitly written “male.” You said that the phrase “of 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 “of the cattle” comes to include blemished animals. For what is the difference between them? Why should one assume that the phrase “of the cattle” includes only female animals but not blemished animals? Rav said: The difference between them is so clear it is as if the weaver's rod [*shivta dekhadkada*]<sup>NLB</sup> is between them: 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.

§ The mishna 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 burnt-offerings. Rabbi Eliezer holds that items suitable for use on the altar that are consecrated without specifying their purpose are consecrated with sanctity that inheres in the item's value, yet they are designated as burnt-offerings. Therefore, everything, including the birds, must be sold to achieve that end.

Rabbi Abbahu said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: The source of Rabbi Eliezer's opinion is: “Speak to Aaron, and to his sons, and to all the children of Israel, and say unto them: Any man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers in Israel, that brings his offering, whether it be any of their vows, or any of their free-will offerings, which are brought to the Lord as a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 22:18). The verse is taken to mean that all vows or free-will offerings that can be brought to the Lord, i.e., animals, are consecrated to be sacrificed as burnt-offerings, unless otherwise specified.

The next verse states: “That you may be accepted, you shall sacrifice a male without blemish” (Leviticus 22:19). I might have thought this verse teaches that an unspecified consecration can be fulfilled with the sacrifice of any unblemished male, even birds. To reject this possibility, the continuation of the verse states: “Of the cattle” (Leviticus 22:19), which includes only domesticated animals and not birds.

Rabbi Yirmeya and Rabbi Bun bar Hiyya were sitting and saying: There, in explanation of the *baraita* cited above concerning one who consecrated a female animal for a burnt-offering, Rabbi Yoḥanan said that the reason for Rabbi Shimon's opinion, as cited by the first *tanna*, that the female is consecrated with the inherent sanctity of a burnt-offering is that there is that there is a case of a female bird that is valid to be brought as a burnt-offering. Yet here, in this case concerning the consecration of a female bird itself, Rabbi Eliezer said this. Presumably, Rabbi Eliezer agrees with Rabbi Yoḥanan's explanation of Rabbi Shimon's opinion. If the argument for a female animal gaining inherent sanctity when consecrated for a burnt-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?