

And let the קידושין spread – לא תניא כולי – through her completely; for did we not learn in a ברייתא, etc.

OVERVIEW

ruled that if a man was מקדש a woman and said to her 'half of you should be מקודשת to me'; there is no קידושין at all. asked why do we not say that this half-קידושין-should spread out and encompass the entire woman, and she should become מקודשת to him completely, as we say concerning קרבנות, that if a person is מקדיש half of an animal for a קרבן, the entire animal becomes a proper קרבן. What is the difference between קידוש קידוש and אשה and a קרבן?! Our תוספות explains and qualifies this question.

asks: תוספות

תימה דבריש תמורה (דף יא,ב) יליף רגלה של זו עולה ובדבר שהנשמה תלויה בו – It is astounding! For in the beginning of תמורה we derive the law concerning if one said the foot of this animal should be an עולה and (the alternate view that there is a requirement that he should be מקדיש) something which the life of the animal depends on it; the ruling is that the entire animal becomes הקדש. This ruling is derived -

מקרא דכתיב¹ כל אשר יתן ממנו לה' –

From the פסוק which states; 'whatever that he shall give from it to ה' - וגבי אשה לא כתיב קראי ואם כן מאי פריך הא לא דמו להדדי –

However concerning קידוש אשה there are no פסוקים written to include partial קידושין; so therefore what is the question; the two (קידוש אשה and קרבן) are not similar to each other (by קרבן there is a פסוק which teaches us the rule of פשטה קדושה בכולה and by אשה there are no such פסוקים). Why should we assume that since by קרבנות there is the rule of פשטה קדושה בכולה that the same should apply to קידוש אשה?!

answers: תוספות

ונראה שלכך דקדק רש"י ופירש² דהא מקודשת בלשון הקדש קאמר לה – And it seems that therefore רש"י was particular when he explained that the term מקודשת was used, for it was with an expression of הקדש that he

¹ The פסוק in כז,ט ויקרא (בחקותי) reads: יהיה קדש כל אשר יתן ממנו לה' יהיה קדש (the entire animal becomes holy). We interpret it to mean that even if you were מקדיש only ממנו (part of the בהמה) nevertheless קדש (the entire animal becomes holy).

² בד"ה ניפשטו.

spoke to her (the same expression as is used by (קרבות תוספות). continues to explain that it is not merely a play on words -

– וכדאמר בריש פירקין³ דאסר לה אכולא עלמא כהקדש שאדם עושה אותה כהקדש –

And as the גמרא **stated in the beginning of this פרק** that the reason the חכמים instituted the term קידושין **for he prohibits her for everyone as if she were הקדש**, meaning **that the husband makes her like הקדש** -

– לפיכך⁴ יש להיות דינה כהקדש –

Therefore it is proper that her status should be comparable to הקדש; just as by הקדש there is the concept of כדולה בכולה, the same should apply to קידושין אשה.

תוספות concludes:

– אבל אם היה אומר מאורסת או חד מהנהו לי שני דלעיל (דף ו,א) –

However, if the husband would have said מאורסת or one of the other expressions of אירוסין that were mentioned **previously** (but not מקודשת) -

על זה לא היה מקשה ונפשטו קידושין בכולה לפירוש זה:

Then, according to this explanation (of רש"י) the גמרא **would not have asked** concerning these cases that וניפשטו קידושין בכולה, since the expression of הקדש was not used in creating the marriage.

SUMMARY

The (attempted) comparison between קידושין אשה and קרבן (concerning פשטה) is only if he used the term מקודשת in betrothing her (for it indicates a type of הקדש [where the idea of פשטה קדושה applies]), however if he used a different term for the אירוסין, there was never any thought to compare it to a קרבן since by a קרבן there is a פסוק that teaches the rule of פשטה קדושה בכולה (by הקדש).

THINKING IT OVER

Seemingly by every קידושין (even if he says מאורסת, etc.) she becomes אסורה to everyone as הקדש. Why therefore is there a difference whether he said מקודשת or מאורסת?⁵

³ תוספות ד"ה דאסר ב,ב; see there.

⁴ This would seem to mean that since he used a term of הקדש the intent of the מקדש was that the rules of הקדש apply, and just as by הקדש there is a concept of פשטה קדושה, here too it is his intent that it should be פשטה קדושה בכולה. (The גמרא replies that his intent alone is insufficient; it is necessary that she also agree.)

⁵ See אמ"ה footnote 181 and onwards.