דַּף יוֹמִי · עֲרָכִין · דַּף ה׳

Daf Yomi · The Full Daf · Elucidated Talmud · Navy & Gold Edition · with Rashi

📖 THE SUGYA

We start off on this daf continuing our deep lomdishe shakla v'tarya regarding someone who sanctifies a single limb of an animal. The Gemara explores the machlokes between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis: if a person designates a non-vital limb like a leg for an olah, does the sanctity spread to the entire animal, or does the animal have to be sold while only the value of that limb goes to the Mikdash? We dive into Rava's chakiros, distinguishing between kedushas ha'guf (inherent holiness for the mizbeach) and kedushas damim (monetary value), as well as differentiating between unblemished animals, blemished animals, and humans.

From there, the Gemara presents several fascinating safeks raised by Rabba, Rava, and Rav Ashi about one who mixes up different halachic realms—such as pledging a person's erech specifically for the mizbeach, or sanctifying an ancestral field (sdei achuzah) for the mizbeach. We then move on to a new Mishnah discussing a newborn child under a month old, bringing us to a classic machlokes between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis over whether a person's words can be rendered totally in vain when making an invalid vow.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עַמּוּד א׳ DAF 5A

BRAISA

”רַגְלָהּ שֶׁל זוֹ עוֹלָה” —

If a person says, **“The leg of this** animal **is an olah,”**

BRAISA

יָכוֹל תְּהֵא כּוּלָּהּ עוֹלָה?

you might think that all of it should become an olah through this single leg?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ”כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן מִמֶּנּוּ לַה׳ יִהְיֶה קֹדֶשׁ” —

Therefore **the verse states: “Any of it that a person gives to Hashem shall be holy”—**

EXPLANATION

מִמֶּנּוּ קוֹדֶשׁ וְלֹא כּוּלָּהּ קוֹדֶשׁ.

meaning only **part of it**, that which he specified, **is holy, but not all of it is holy.**

BRAISA

יָכוֹל תֵּצֵא לְחוּלִּין?

If so, **you might think that** that limb **should return to non-sacred status** because an isolated leg cannot be offered on the mizbeach?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "יִהְיֶה" — בַּהֲוָיָיתָהּ תְּהֵא.

Therefore **the verse states: "It shall be,"** teaching that **it shall remain in its state** of holiness.

QUESTION

הָא כֵּיצַד?

How so? What should be done with this animal?

ANSWER

תִּמָּכֵר לְצוֹרְכֵי עוֹלוֹת, וְדָמֶיהָ חוּלִּין, חוּץ מִדְּמֵי אוֹתוֹ אֵבֶר שֶׁבָּהּ, דִּבְרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

It should be sold for the needs of olos to someone who wants to bring an olah, **and its proceeds are non-sacred except for the proceeds of that limb in it** which are given to the Mikdash; these are **the words of Rabbi Meir.**

BRAISA

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמְרִים: מִנַּיִן לָאוֹמֵר "רַגְלָהּ שֶׁל זוֹ עוֹלָה", שֶׁכּוּלָּהּ עוֹלָה?

Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: From where do we know that for one who says, "The leg of this animal is an olah," that all of it becomes an olah?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן מִמֶּנּוּ לַה' יִהְיֶה קֹדֶשׁ", לְרַבּוֹת אֶת כּוּלָּהּ.

The verse states: "Any of it that a person gives to Hashem shall be holy," which comes **to include all of it** as holy.

OBJECTION

וַאֲפִילּוּ לְמַאן דְּאָמַר אֵין כּוּלָּהּ עוֹלָה, הָנֵי מִילֵּי דְּאַקְדֵּישׁ דָּבָר שֶׁאֵין הַנְּשָׁמָה תְּלוּיָה בּוֹ, אֲבָל דָּבָר שֶׁהַנְּשָׁמָה תְּלוּיָה בּוֹ — קָדְשָׁה כּוּלָּהּ.

And even according to the one who says, namely Rabbi Meir, that **not all of it becomes an olah, those words apply only when he sanctified a part that life does not depend on,** such as a leg; **but if he sanctified a part that life depends on,** like the head, **all of it becomes holy.** Now, this presents a difficulty for Rava, who explained a previous braisa as referring to money-sanctity where even the head shouldn't sanctify the whole body!

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא, לָא קַשְׁיָא: הָא בִּקְדוּשַּׁת הַגּוּף, הָא בִּקְדוּשַּׁת דָּמִים.

Rather, Rava retracts his previous answer and says: **It is not difficult. This** braisa, which says that sanctifying a vital organ sanctifies the entire animal, is speaking **of inherent holiness** of the animal itself for the mizbeach; whereas **that** braisa, which implies that sanctifying the head does not sanctify the rest, is speaking **of monetary holiness** for the value of the animal.

OBJECTION

וְהָא מָר הוּא דְּאָמַר: מַקְדִּישׁ זָכָר לְדָמָיו — קָדוֹשׁ קְדוּשַּׁת הַגּוּף!

But wasn't it the Master, Rava himself, **who said** elsewhere that **one who sanctifies a male animal for its monetary value, it becomes holy with inherent holiness** and must be offered on the mizbeach itself?

RESOLUTION

לָא קַשְׁיָא: הָא דְּאַקְדֵּישׁ כּוּלָּהּ, הָא דְּאַקְדֵּישׁ חַד אֵבֶר.

Rava answers: **It is not difficult. This** ruling, that monetary consecration transforms into inherent body sanctity, applies **where he sanctified all of it;** whereas **that** case where it stays monetary sanctity is **where he sanctified only one limb.**

OBJECTION

חַד אֵבֶר נָמֵי אִיבְּעוֹיֵי אִיבַּעְיָא לַן, דְּבָעֵי רַבָּה: הִקְדִּישׁ אֵבֶר לְדָמָיו, מַהוּ?

Abaye objects: **Sanctifying one limb for its monetary value was also a she'elah raised by us, as Rabba asked: If someone sanctified a limb for its monetary value, what is the din?** Does the whole animal become holy or not?

RESOLUTION

כִּי אִיבְּעִי לַן בְּתָם, הָכָא בְּבַעַל מוּם, דּוּמְיָא דַּחֲמוֹר.

Rava answers: **When our she'elah was raised, it was regarding an unblemished animal** which is fit for the mizbeach; whereas **here,** the braisa is dealing **with a blemished animal, similar to a donkey,** which can never be offered on the mizbeach.

OBJECTION

בַּעַל מוּם נָמֵי אִיבְּעוֹיֵי אִיבַּעְיָא לַן, דְּבָעֵי רַבָּה: "דְּמֵי רֹאשִׁי לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ" מַהוּ?

Abaye challenges again: **A blemished animal was also a she'elah raised by us, as Rabba asked: If someone says, "The value of my head is upon me for the mizbeach," what is the din?** A human is like a blemished animal since he cannot be offered on the mizbeach, yet Rabba asked if his entire value is sanctified!

RESOLUTION

כִּי אִבַּעְיָא לָן מִקַּמֵּי דְּאֶשְׁמְעַהּ לְהָא מַתְנִיתָא, הַשְׁתָּא דְּשַׁמְעַהּ הָא מַתְנִיתָא — לָא מִיבַּעְיָא לַן.

Rava answers: **When this she'elah was raised by us, it was before we heard this braisa; now that we have heard this braisa, we no longer ask the she'elah,** because the braisa clearly proves that sanctifying a single limb for monetary value does not spread to the rest.

QUESTION

גּוּפָא, בָּעֵי רַבָּה: "דְּמֵי רֹאשִׁי לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ" מַהוּ? נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ, אוֹ אֵינוֹ נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ?

The Gemara returns to **the matter itself: Rabba asked: If a person says, "The value of my head is upon me for the mizbeach," what is the din? Is he judged by his most honored part,** meaning since he vowed a vital organ, he must pay his entire value, **or is he not judged by his most honored part?**

EXPLANATION

לָא אַשְׁכְּחַן בְּדָמִים דְּאֵינוֹ נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ, אוֹ דִלְמָא לָא אַשְׁכְּחַן לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ דְּנִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ?

The Gemara explains the two sides: On the one hand, **we do not find anywhere by monetary vows that a person is not judged by his most honored part; or perhaps we do not find regarding the mizbeach that anything is judged by its most honored part?**

STATEMENT

תֵּיקוּ.

The Gemara concludes: Let the question **stand unresolved.**

QUESTION

בָּעֵי רָבָא: ״עֶרְכִּי עָלַי לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ״ מַהוּ? נִידּוֹן בְּהֶשֵּׂג יָד, אוֹ אֵין נִידּוֹן בְּהֶשֵּׂג יָד?

Rava asked: If a person says, "My erech, valuation, is upon me for the mizbeach," what is the din? Is he judged by affordability, meaning if he is poor he pays according to his means as by regular arachin, **or is he not judged by affordability?**

EXPLANATION

לָא אַשְׁכְּחַן בַּעֲרָכִין דְּאֵין נִידּוֹן בְּהֶשֵּׂג יָד, אוֹ דִלְמָא לָא אַשְׁכְּחַן לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ דְּמִיפְרִיק אֶלָּא בְּשָׁוְויו?

The Gemara explains the sides: On the one hand, **we do not find by arachin that one is not judged by affordability; or perhaps we do not find regarding the mizbeach that anything is redeemed except for its full value?**

STATEMENT

תֵּיקוּ.

The Gemara concludes: Let the question **stand unresolved.**

QUESTION

בָּעֵי רַב אָשֵׁי: הִקְדִּישׁ שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ, מַהוּ?

Rav Ashi asked: If one sanctified an ancestral field for the mizbeach, what is the din?

EXPLANATION

מִי אָמְרִינַן: לָא אַשְׁכְּחַן שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה דְּמִיפְרְקָא אֶלָּא ״בֵּית זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כָּסֶף״, אוֹ דִלְמָא לָא אַשְׁכְּחַן לְגַבֵּי מִזְבֵּחַ דְּמִיפְרִיק אֶלָּא בְּשָׁוְויו?

Do we say: We do not find an ancestral field that is redeemed except at the fixed rate of fifty silver shekels for an area sown with a chomer of barley; or perhaps we do not find regarding the mizbeach that anything is redeemed except for its actual value?

STATEMENT

תֵּיקוּ.

The Gemara concludes: Let the question **stand unresolved.**

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳ פָּחוֹת מִבֶּן חֹדֶשׁ נִידָּר, אֲבָל לֹא נֶעֱרָךְ.

MISHNAH: A child less than a month old can be vowed for his monetary value, **but cannot be evaluated** for a fixed erech.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

גְּמָ׳ תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: הַמַּעֲרִיךְ פָּחוֹת מִבֶּן חֹדֶשׁ, רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר: נוֹתֵן דָּמָיו, וַחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים: לֹא אָמַר כְּלוּם.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a braisa: **If one evaluates a child less than a month old, Rabbi Meir says: He gives his monetary value; and the Sages say: He has said nothing at all** and is exempt from paying.

QUESTION

בְּמַאי קָמִיפַּלְגִי?

The Gemara asks: **In what dispute do they differ?** What is the underlying rationale of their machlokes?

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי מֵאִיר סָבַר: אֵין אָדָם מוֹצִיא דְּבָרָיו לְבַטָּלָה, יוֹדֵעַ שֶׁאֵין עֲרָכִין לְפָחוֹת מִבֶּן חֹדֶשׁ, וְגָמַר וְאָמַר לְשֵׁם דָּמִים;

The Gemara explains: **Rabbi Meir holds that a person does not utter his words in vain, for he knows that there are no arachin for a child less than a month old, and he fully resolved and spoke for the purpose of pledging his monetary value;**

EXPLANATION

וְרַבָּנַן סָבְרִי: אָדָם מוֹצִיא דְּבָרָיו לְבַטָּלָה.

and the Rabbis hold that a person does utter his words in vain, so he simply erred in the halachah thinking there was an erech, and since there is none, his statement is meaningless.

INFERENCE

כְּמַאן אָזְלָא הָא דְּאָמַר רַב גִּידֵּל אָמַר רַב: הָאוֹמֵר ״עֶרְכִּי כְּלִי עָלַי״ נוֹתֵן דָּמִים — כְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר.

The Gemara asks: **Like whom does that which Rav Giddel said in the name of Rav go, namely: One who says, "The erech of a vessel is upon me," must pay its monetary value?** This goes **like Rabbi Meir,** who says we assume he meant monetary value.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא דִּכְרַבִּי מֵאִיר אַתְיָא!

The Gemara asks: **It is obvious that it comes like Rabbi Meir!** What is the chiddush of stating this?

ANSWER

מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא, אֲפִילּוּ כְּרַבָּנַן, הָתָם הוּא דְּטָעֵי, סָבַר: כִּי הֵיכִי דְּאִיכָּא עֲרָכִין לְבֶן חוֹדֶשׁ, אִיכָּא נָמֵי לְפָחוֹת מִבֶּן חוֹדֶשׁ.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say that Rav's statement can go even like the Rabbis,** for **it is only there,** by a infant, **that a person makes a mistake, as he thinks: Just as there are arachin for a one-month-old, there are also arachin for one less than a month old;**

EXPLANATION

אֲבָל הָכָא דְּלֵיכָּא לְמִיטְעֵי, וַדַּאי אָדָם יוֹדֵעַ שֶׁאֵין עֵרֶךְ לִכְלִי, וְגָמַר וְאָמַר לְשֵׁם דָּמִים, קָמַשְׁמַע לַן.

but here, by a vessel, **where there is no room to err, a person certainly knows that there is no erech for an inanimate vessel, and he surely resolved and spoke for the purpose of pledging its monetary value; therefore, Rav comes to teach us** that even so, it follows only Rabbi Meir's rationale.

עמוד ב׳ DAF 5B

QUESTION

וּלְרַבִּי מֵאִיר לְמַאי אִיצְטְרִיךְ?

The Gemara asks: **And according to Rabbi Meir, for what** reason **was it necessary** for Rav to state his ruling regarding a utensil? Isn't it obvious from the ruling about a baby?

ANSWER

מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא: טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר הָתָם, דְּגָזַר פָּחוֹת מִבֶּן חוֹדֶשׁ אַטּוּ בֶּן חוֹדֶשׁ, אֲבָל הָכָא דְּלֵיכָּא לְמִיגְזַר — אֵימָא לָא.

The Gemara answers: It was necessary, **Lest you say** that **the reason of Rabbi Meir there,** by a baby under a month, is **that he decreed** regarding a child **less than a month old on account of** a child who is **a month old** so people shouldn't get confused, **but here** regarding a utensil **where there is no reason to decree, say no,** Rabbi Meir would not obligate him. Therefore Rav needed to speak.

EXPLANATION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן: טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר דְּאֵין אָדָם מוֹצִיא דְּבָרָיו לְבַטָּלָה, לָא שְׁנָא הָכָא וְלָא שְׁנָא הָכָא.

So Rav **comes to teach us: The reason of Rabbi Meir is that a person does not utter his words in vain,** and therefore **it makes no difference here and it makes no difference here;** in both cases he meant to give the monetary value.

QUESTION

כְּמַאן אָזְלָא הָא דְּאָמַר רַבָּה בַּר יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַב, וְאָמְרִי לַהּ אָמַר רַב יֶיבָא בַּר יוֹסֵי אָמַר רַב: הַמַּקְדִּישׁ בְּהֶמַת חֲבֵירוֹ נוֹתֵן דָּמֶיהָ?

The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose** opinion **goes that which Rabba bar Yosef said that Rav said—and some say** it was **Rav Yeiva bar Yosei** who **said that Rav said: One who consecrates the animal of his friend must give its monetary value?**

ANSWER

כְּמַאן — כְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר.

The Gemara answers: **In accordance with whose** opinion? **In accordance with Rabbi Meir,** who holds that a person does not utter his words for nothing, so he must have meant to pay its value.

OBJECTION

הָא אַמְרַהּ רַב חֲדָא זִימְנָא, דְּאָמַר רַב גִּידֵּל אָמַר רַב: הָאוֹמֵר ״עֵרֶךְ כְּלִי עָלַי״ נוֹתֵן דָּמָיו!

The Gemara asks: **But didn't Rav say this once** already? **For Rav Giddel said that Rav said: One who says, "The erech of a utensil is upon me," must give its monetary value!** Why repeat the same chiddush?

ANSWER

מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא הָתָם הוּא דְּיוֹדֵעַ שֶׁאֵין עֵרֶךְ לִכְלִי, וְגָמַר וְאָמַר לְשֵׁם דָּמִים.

The Gemara answers: Both rulings were necessary, **Lest you say** that **it is only there** by a utensil **that he knows that there is no erech for a utensil, and** therefore he **fully resolved and spoke for the sake of monetary value.**

EXPLANATION

אֲבָל בְּהֵמָה, דְּבַת מִיקְדַּשׁ הִיא, אִיכָּא לְמֵימַר דְּהָכִי קָאָמַר: אִי אָמֵינָא לֵיהּ לְמַרֵיהּ מְזַבֵּין לַהּ נִיהֲלִי, תִּיקְדּוֹשׁ לַהּ מֵהַשְׁתָּא וְאַקְרְבַהּ, אֲבָל דְּמֵי לָא קָאָמַר, קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

But an animal, which is subject to being consecrated, there is room to say that this is what he is saying to himself: **If I say to its owner he will sell it to me, so let it be holy from now and I will offer it up** later, **but he did not mean to obligate himself for its monetary value;** therefore Rav **comes to teach us** that we still apply Rabbi Meir's principle.

RULING

אָמַר רַב אָשֵׁי: וְהוּא דְּאָמַר ״עָלַי״, אֲבָל אָמַר ״חֲרֵי זוֹ״ — לֹא.

Rav Ashi said: And this ruling of Rav **is only when he said, "It is upon me"** as a personal obligation, **but if he said, "Behold this animal** is consecrated," **it is not** holy at all, nor is he obligated to pay, since he clearly tried to directly consecrate something that isn't his.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳ נָכְרִי — רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר: נֶעֱרָךְ, אֲבָל לֹא מַעֲרִיךְ.

MISHNAH: Regarding a **non-Jew—Rabbi Meir says: He can be valuated** if a Jew vows his erech, **but he cannot valuate** anyone.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: מַעֲרִיךְ, אֲבָל לֹא נֶעֱרָךְ.

Rabbi Yehuda says: He can valuate, but he cannot be valuated.

MISHNAH

וְזֶה וָזֶה מוֹדִים שֶׁנּוֹדְרִין וְנִידָּרִין.

And both this Tanna and that Tanna agree that they can make standard vows of monetary value and be the subject of standard vows of monetary value.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

גְּמָ׳ תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעֲרִיכִין וְאֵין הַגּוֹיִם מַעֲרִיכִין.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The pasuk states, **"The Children of Israel" can valuate, but non-Jews cannot valuate.**

BRAISA

יָכוֹל לֹא יְהוּ נֶעֱרָכִין? תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "אִישׁ", דִּבְרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

One **might have thought that they cannot be valuated either? The Torah verse comes to teach us: "A man"**—to include anyone; these are **the words of Rabbi Meir.**

BRAISA

אָמַר רַבִּי מֵאִיר: וְכִי מֵאַחַר שֶׁמִּקְרָא אֶחָד מְרַבֶּה וּמִקְרָא אֶחָד מְמַעֵט, מִפְּנֵי מָה אֲנִי אוֹמֵר נֶעֱרָךְ וְלֹא מַעֲרִיךְ?

Rabbi Meir said: Now since one verse includes non-Jews **and one verse excludes** them, **for what reason do I say he can be valuated but cannot valuate?**

BRAISA

מִפְּנֵי שֶׁרִיבְּתָה הַכָּתוּב בַּמַּעֲרִיכִין יוֹתֵר מִבַּמַּעֲרִיכִין, שֶׁהֲרֵי חֵרֵשׁ שׁוֹטֶה וְקָטָן נֶעֱרָךְ, אֲבָל לֹא מַעֲרִיכִין.

Because the Scripture included more in the category of those who can be valuated than in those who can valuate, for behold, a deaf-mute, a deranged person, and a minor can be valuated, but they cannot valuate.

BRAISA

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶעֱרָכִין וְאֵין הַגּוֹיִם נֶעֱרָכִין; יָכוֹל לֹא יְהוּ מַעֲרִיכִין? תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "אִישׁ".

Rabbi Yehuda says: "The Children of Israel" can be valuated, but non-Jews cannot be valuated; one **might have thought they cannot valuate either? The verse teaches us: "A man."**

BRAISA

אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: וְכִי מֵאַחַר שֶׁמִּקְרָא אֶחָד מְרַבֶּה וּמִקְרָא אֶחָד מְמַעֵט, מִפְּנֵי מָה אֲנִי אוֹמֵר נָכְרִי מַעֲרִיךְ וְלֹא נֶעֱרָךְ?

Rabbi Yehuda said: Now since one verse includes and one verse excludes, for what reason do I say a non-Jew can valuate but cannot be valuated?

BRAISA

מִפְּנֵי שֶׁרִיבְּתָה הַכָּתוּב בַּמַּעֲרִיכִין יוֹתֵר מִבַּנֶּעֱרָכִין, שֶׁהֲרֵי טוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס מַעֲרִיכִין אֲבָל לֹא נֶעֱרָכִין.

Because the Scripture included more in the category of those who valuate than in those who are valuated, for behold, a tumtum and an androganos can valuate, but they cannot be valuated.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רָבָא: הִלְכְתֵיהּ דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר מִסְתַּבְּרָא, טַעְמֵיהּ לָא מִסְתַּבְּרָא, טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מִסְתַּבְּרָא, הִלְכְתֵיהּ לָא מִסְתַּבְּרָא.

Rava said: The halachic conclusion of Rabbi Meir makes sense, but his reason does not make sense; the reason of Rabbi Yehuda makes sense, but his halachic conclusion does not make sense.

EXPLANATION

הִלְכְתֵיהּ דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר מִסְתַּבְּרָא, דִּכְתִיב: "לֹא לָכֶם וָלָנוּ לִבְנוֹת אֶת בֵּית אֱלֹהֵינוּ",

Rava explains: **The halachic conclusion of Rabbi Meir makes sense, as it is written: "It is not for you and for us to build the House of our God,"** showing that non-Jews do not contribute to Bedek HaBayis.

EXPLANATION

טַעְמֵיהּ לָא מִסְתַּבְּרָא, דְּקָא מַיְיתֵי לֵיהּ מֵחֵרֵשׁ שׁוֹטֶה וְקָטָן, שָׁאנֵי חֵרֵשׁ שׁוֹטֶה וְקָטָן דְּלָאו בְּנֵי דֵּעָה נִינְהוּ.

However, **his reason does not make sense, for he brings proof from a deaf-mute, a deranged person, and a minor;** but **a deaf-mute, a deranged person, and a minor are different, because they do not have full mental capacity,** whereas a non-Jew has full mental capacity.

EXPLANATION

טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מִסְתַּבְּרָא, דְּקָא מַיְיתֵי לֵיהּ מִטּוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס, דְּאַף עַל גַּב דִּבְנֵי דֵּעָה נִינְהוּ מַעֲטִינְהוּ רַחֲמָנָא.

The reason of Rabbi Yehuda makes sense, for he brings proof from a tumtum and an androganos, that even though they have full mental capacity, the Merciful One excluded them.

EXPLANATION

הִלְכְתֵיהּ לָא מִסְתַּבְּרָא, דִּכְתִיב: "לֹא לָכֶם וָלָנוּ לִבְנוֹת אֶת בֵּית אֱלֹהֵינוּ".

Yet **his halachic conclusion does not make sense, as it is written: "It is not for you and for us to build the House of our God."**

QUESTION

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, הַאי "לָא לָכֶם וָלָנוּ" מַאי עָבֵיד לֵיהּ?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Yehuda, this** pasuk of **"It is not for you and for us", what does he do with it?** How does he handle it if he allows non-Jews to valuate?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב חִסְדָּא אָמַר אֲבִימִי: וְעָרְכוּ נִגְנָז.

Rav Chisda said that Avimi said: According to Rabbi Yehuda, a non-Jew can valuate, **and his valuation money is hidden away** rather than used for the Temple upkeep.

OBJECTION

אֶלָּא מֵעַתָּה, לֹא יִמְעֲלוּ בּוֹ, דִּתְנַן: חָמֵשׁ חַטָּאוֹת הַמֵּתוֹת, וּמָעוֹת הַהוֹלְכוֹת לְיָם הַמֶּלַח — לֹא נֶהֱנִין וְלֹא מוֹעֲלִין!

The Gemara challenges: **If that is so, let there be no me'ilah with it! As we learned** in a Mishnah: Regarding **the five sin-offerings that are left to die, and money that is taken to the Salt Sea—one may not derive benefit from them, but one is not subject to me'ilah** if he does!

OBJECTION

אַלְמָה תַּנְיָא גַּבֵּי קָדְשֵׁי גּוֹיִם: בַּמֶּה דְּבָרִים אֲמוּרִים — בְּקָדְשֵׁי מִזְבֵּחַ, אֲבָל בְּקָדְשֵׁי בֶדֶק הַבַּיִת מוֹעֲלִין בָּהֶן?!

Why then was it taught in a Braisa **regarding consecrated property of non-Jews: In what case are these words said? With regard to consecrated items for the Altar, but with regard to consecrated items for the Bedek HaBayis, one is subject to me'ilah in them?!** This refutes Avimi's explanation.

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא אָמַר רָבָא: מִשּׁוּם רְפְיוֹן יָדַיִם הוּא, דִּכְתִיב: "וַיְהִי עַם הָאָרֶץ מְרַפִּין יְדֵי עַם יְהוּדָה וּמְבַהֲלִים אוֹתָם לִבְנוֹת".

Rather, Rava said: The rejection in Ezra **was because of weakening their hands, as it is written: "And the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Yehuda, and frightened them from building."** It was a temporary decree due to their hostility, not a biblical exclusion from donating to Bedek HaBayis.

SUMMARY

The Gemara analyzes the braisa regarding one who sanctifies a leg or a head of an animal, clarifying Rava's view on how monetary sanctity differs from body sanctity and how these halachos apply to blemished versus unblemished animals. The Sugya then presents unresolved she'elos: whether pledging the head of a human requires paying his entire value, whether an erech pledged for the mizbeach is judged by affordability, and whether an ancestral field sanctified for the mizbeach is redeemed at its fixed Torah rate or its full market value. Finally, the Mishnah states that a child under thirty days old has no fixed erech, and the Gemara explains a machlokes where Rabbi Meir holds he must pay monetary value because a person does not speak in vain, whereas the Sages hold his statement is void.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

Look at the fascinating machlokes on our daf between Rabbi Meir and the Chachamim. When a person makes an expression that seems to have no halachic standing, like saying "Erech keli alai," I vow the biblical valuation of an inanimate vessel, Rabbi Meir holds that ein adam motzi dvarav l'vatala. A Yid doesn't just spew empty words! He knows there is no such thing as an erech on a vessel, so he obviously meant to sanctify its actual monetary value.

Think about what Rabbi Meir is telling us about ourselves. Every word that comes out of a Yid's mouth has weight, has kavod, and carries hidden pshat. We often catch ourselves making careless statements, talking without thinking, or throwing out empty phrases. But in Hashem's eyes, your speech is powerful. If Chazal look for the deep, inner intent behind an impossible statement just to ensure a Yid's words are not lost to thin air, how much more careful must we be with the power of our speech!

Today, take one minute before you speak, whether in a shmuess, with your family, or in business, to pause and treat your words with gravity. Make sure that what comes out of your mouth is intentional, holy, and built to construct rather than to be motzi dvarim l'vatala.