



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

Shekalim Daf Yud Beis

MISHNA

- One who makes his possessions hekdesch, without specifying what type of hekdesch he meant, and some of the items were fit to be used as korbanos of the tzibbur, **R' Akiva** says they should be given to workers as payment (and then repurchased with new shekalim). **Ben Azai** said, that is not consistent with the way we dealt with the ketores previously. Rather, we should take chullin money, have the kedusha of the items go onto the money, give the items to the workers as their pay, and then repurchase the items with the new shekalim.
- One who makes his possessions hekdesch, without specifying what type of hekdesch he meant, and some of the items were fit to be used as korbanos on the Mizbe'ach, **R' Eliezer** says, the males should be sold to be used for Olos, and the females should be sold to be used for Shelamim. The money that is received, should go along with all the other possessions for bedek habayis. **R' Yehoshua** says, the males should themselves be brought as Olos, the females should be sold and the proceeds used to bring Olos, and the rest of the possessions should be used for bedek habayis.
 - **R' Akiva** said, the view of **R' Eliezer** seems more understandable, because he is consistent in the application of his rule.
 - **R' Papayus** said, I have heard that **R' Eliezer's** view seems correct when one says, "I am makdish my possessions and my animals". In that case he equates the animals to his other possessions, showing that he wants them all to go to bedek habayis. And, I have heard that **R' Yehoshua's** view seems correct when one simply says, "I am makdish all my possessions". In that case, we assume that he wants his possessions to be used for the maximum kedusha possible. Therefore, the animals must be used for Olos.
- One who makes his possessions hekdesch, without specifying what type of hekdesch he meant, and some of the items were fit to be used on the Mizbe'ach, such as wine, oil, or birds, **R' Eliezer** says that they should be sold for what they can be used for on the Mizbe'ach (for use as nesachim, a mincha, etc.) and the money received should be used to purchase Olos. The remaining possessions should be used for bedek habayis.

GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan** said that the possessions fit to be a korbon tzibbur, mentioned in the first part of the Mishna, refers to someone who is makdish ketores that he has in his possession. **R' Hoshaya** explained, this can be referring to people who worked on the ketores and received it as their wages, who were makdish it before Hekdesch had a chance to buy it back.
 - The machlokes between **R' Akiva** and **Ben Azai** is, that **Ben Azai** says that hekdesch cannot become deconsecrated onto labor (it needs to be deconsecrated onto something tangible).
- A Mishna says, kodesch of bedek habayis is different in that: unspecified hekdeishos go to bedek habayis, it takes effect on everything, one commits me'ilah by benefitting from something that grows from them, and Kohanim do not benefit from it.
 - **R' Chananya** said, this Mishna follows the shitah of **R' Eliezer** of our Mishna, who says that when one makes his possessions kodesch, without specifying what type of hekdesch, all the possessions, even animals that are fit to go on the Mizbe'ach, go for bedek habayis (the animals are sold for korbonos and the proceeds used for bedek habayis).

- **R' Ze'irah** says, **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua** in our Mishna only argue when one is makdish all his possessions. However, if one is makdish only his animals, even **R' Eliezer** would agree that the animals become hekdesch for the Mizbe'ach.
 - **R' Ba** says, they only argue when one is makdish only his animals. However, if one is makdish all his possessions, all would agree that it becomes hekdesch for bedek habayis.
 - **Q:** Since animals are fit for the Mizbe'ach, how can we say that if a person is makdish only his animals it would go for bedek habayis!? **A:** The fact that he did not specify is the equivalent of him saying that it should go for the bedek habayis.
 - **R' Yochanan** says, the machlokes is in the case where one is makdish all his possessions *and* where one is makdish only his animals.
- **R' Yochanan** said, if animals without a mum, belonging to bedek habayis, are redeemed, they become fully chullin.
 - A proof can be brought from a Mishna which says that an animal which had a mum before being made hekdesch (and therefore only has monetary kedusha) and is then redeemed, it becomes fully chullin. Bedek habayis, which also only has monetary kedusha, should therefore also become fully chullin when redeemed.
 - **R' Chizkiya in the name of R' Chisda** said, it could be that bedek habayis are only similar to that case once they get a mum, not before that. **R' Yosa** said, that this is actually the way it is taught in a Mishna.
 - **R' Chizkiya in the name of R' Yosa** said, it must be that the animals of bedek habayis, even without a mum, becomes fully chullin when redeemed. If we do not say so, how can kedushas Mizbe'ach take hold on the animal that still has kedushas bedek habayis!?
 - It may be that as soon as the animal of bedek habayis is redeemed, the **Rabanan** instituted that a level of kedushas Mizbe'ach takes hold on the animal (prohibiting work and shearing), and doesn't allow it to become fully chullin.
- A Braisa says, if one designates a female animal for an Olah, Pesach, or Asham, it gets "kedushas haguf" and an act of Temurah done to the animal will take effect. **R' Shimon** says, Temura will only take effect for a female designated as an Olah, but not for a female designated as a Pesach or an Asham. **R' Shimon ben Yehuda said in the name of R' Shimon**, in any of the cases, Temurah will not take effect.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, the reason for **R' Shimon** is that we find a female bird is valid as an Olah, and therefore a female animal designated as an Olah gets kedushas haguf.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, the reason of **R' Shimon ben Yehuda** is, because he says as follows: if an animal is of the right type (e.g. an Asham that is a male) but is of the wrong age, it does not get kedushas haguf, so surely an animal of the wrong type (e.g. a female when the korbon must be a male) does not get kedushas haguf.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, just as **R' Yehoshua** of our Mishna holds that a female designated for an Olah does not get kedushas haguf (because if it did, it could not simply be sold for a Shelamim before it got a mum), **R' Shimon ben Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon** says this as well.

The Braisa continues, **Rebbi** said, I don't agree with **R' Shimon** in regard to a Pesach, because the leftover Pesach gets the status of a Shelamim, and since a female can be brought as a Shelamim, it should get kedushas haguf even as a Pesach.

- **Q:** He should also disagree with **R' Shimon** regarding an Asham, since the leftover Asham is brought as an Olah, and a female brought as an Olah gets kedushas haguf, because a female bird may be brought as an Olah!? **A:** **R' Avin** explained, the actual Pesach animal itself may be brought as a Shelamim, but the actual Asham animal is not brought as an Olah (it is allowed to get a mum and sold, with its proceeds used for an Olah). That is why they are different.
- The point of the machlokes is, that **R' Shimon** says, when a person designates a female as a Pesach, he does not do so with intent for kedushas haguf. **Rebbi** says that he does.

- **R' Ze'irah in the name of Reish Lakish** said, the reason of **R' Yehoshua** is based on a pasuk that teaches, that unless specified otherwise, all animals are to be brought as Olos. Although the pasuk says "zachar", the word "babakar" teaches to include females as well.
 - **Q: R' Yitzchak the son of R' Elazar** asked, maybe "babakar" comes to include even an animal with a mum!? **A: Rav** explained, there is a big difference. A female is fit for some types of korbanos. An animal with a mum is fit for no korbon.

R' ELAZAR OMER YIMACHRU....HAMIN

- **R' Avahu in the name of Reish Lakish** said, the reason of **R' Elazar** is the pasuk which teaches that anything made hekdesch that is fit for the Mizbe'ach, must be brought as an Olah. Therefore, these items are sold and the money is used for an Olah. However, it may not be a bird Olah, because the pasuk says "babakar".
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya and R' Bun bar Chiya** asked, before **R' Yochanan** said, the reason why **R' Shimon** says that a female gets kedushas haguf when designated as an Olah is because a female bird may be brought as an Olah. Now we are saying that birds, which now have kedusha of an Olah, can be sold? They have kedushas haguf and therefore shouldn't be allowed to be sold!? **A: R' Yose** said, something which itself cannot be brought on the Mizbe'ach, and whose value cannot be used for something to be brought on the Mizbe'ach, only gets monetary kedusha. Therefore, this bird, which cannot be brought on the Mizbe'ach (because the pasuk says "babakar") and cannot be redeemed (because birds may not be redeemed) only gets monetary kedusha.