



דף ב.

באחד באדר משמיעין על השקלים

• The Torah commands every adult male Jew [in the time of the Bais Hamikdash] to contribute a *machatzis hashekel* (half-shekel) annually to finance the purchase of *korbonos tzibur* (communal *korbonos*, such as the daily *tamid* and the Shabbos and Yom Tov *musafim*).

The Mishna says that on the first of the month of Adar representatives of *Bais din* would publicly remind everyone to prepare to pay their annual half-shekel dues.

The Gemara (Yerushalmi) derives from p'sukim that *shekalim* left over from a previous year may not be used to purchase *korbonos* for the new year starting Rosh Chodesh Nissan. Each year prior to the month of Nissan *bais din* would collect half-shekalim to be used for the *korbonos* of the new year. The Gemara explains that it was for this reason that the announcement took place on Rosh Chodesh Adar - to allow one month for the collection of the *shekalim*.

[The Gemara in Megillah 29b says that the reading of Parshas *Shekalim* (i.e., the passage at the beginning of Parshas Ki Sisah pertaining to the mitzvah of *machatzis hashekel*) also serves as a reminder to donate *shekalim*. Therefore, Parshas *Shekalim* is read annually around the time of Rosh Chodesh Adar.^{1]}

The Mishnas Eliyahu cites another Gemara which provides another reason for making the *shekalim* announcement on Rosh Chodesh Adar. Resh Lakish (Megillah 13b) says that

shekalim are announced at the beginning of Adar because Hashem knew that the wicked Haman would eventually try to destroy *Klal Yisrael* on the thirteenth of Adar through the payment of *shekalim* (10,000 silver *kikarim*) to Achashveirosh.² To counter Haman's power, Hashem had *B'nai Yisrael* donate *shekalim* to the Bais Hamikdash beforehand, and in the merit of these *shekalim* they were spared.

The Maharsha³ indicates that the different reasons given by these two Gemaros are complementary. Based on a posuk, we know that beginning with Rosh Chodesh Nissan the *korbonos tzibur* must be purchased with the new *shekalim* designated for the new year. Our Gemara explains that in order to provide sufficient time for collection of *shekalim* before Nissan the sages said to make *shekalim* announcements on Rosh Chodesh Adar. The sages living prior to the story of Purim did not base their enactment on Haman's future decree.

When Resh Lakish says that *shekalim* are given before Purim as an antidote to Haman's *shekalim*, he means that it was for this reason that Hashem deliberately designated the month of Nissan as the time to start using the new *shekalim* (rather than another month). Hashem knew in His infinite wisdom that if Rosh Chodesh Nissan was the cutoff date for using old *shekalim*, *Klal Yisrael* would begin collecting *shekalim* at the beginning of Adar, prior to the Purim date, and this would serve as a merit to offset Haman's eventual plot to wipe out the Jewish nation in the month of Adar.

דף ג:

אין ממשכנין את הקטנים

The Mishna (1:3) says that קטנים - minors - were not compelled to pay the *machatzis hashekel* tax. The Gemara 3b says (according to one version cited by the commentators, see Korbon Ho'eidah, Taklin Chaditin, Mishnas Eliyahu and HaGaos HaGra), a *machatzis hashekel* is solicited even from children once they reach halachic majority (i.e., the age of Bar Mitzvah). However, *bais din* does not forcibly extract a *machatzis hashekel* from individuals below the age of twenty.⁴

Indeed, this is the ruling of the Roke'ach - that *bais din* does not forcibly extract *machatzis hashekel* dues from individuals below the age of twenty.

The Rambam,⁵ however, has a different גירסא - version of the Gemara - which does not distinguish between a thirteen-year-old child and a twenty-year-old. According to the Rambam, anyone above the age of Bar Mitzvah is forced to give a *machatzis hashekel*.

The Har Ephraim⁶ asks why, according to the Roke'ach, did *bais din* try to solicit a *machatzis hashekel* from boys above the age of Bar Mitzvah if there is no actual obligation to pay these dues until the age of twenty?

In answer, the Har Ephraim explains that there are two reasons for the mitzvah of *machatzis hashekel*: (a) The posuk states זה יתנו - כל העובר על הפקודים וכו' - this they shall give, all who pass among the counted ones (Sh'mos 30:13), and (b) to ensure that every individual has a share in the communal *korbonos* so that they can provide atonement for everyone. By giving a *machatzis hashekel* one discharges both requirements.⁷

A lad before the age of twenty is exempt from mitzvah "A" because the posuk links this mitzvah to the census (i.e., זה יתנו כל העובר על הפקודים) and individuals under the age of twenty were not counted, as stated explicitly in that passage regarding the census (Sh'mos 30:14).⁸ Nevertheless, thirteen-year-old boys were asked to donate a *machatzis hashekel* because they are required to participate in the

purchase of the *korbonos tzibur* (mitzvah "B").

The Toras Kohanim⁹ derives from the posuk לרצונכם (of your own volition, Vayikra 23:13) that אין כופין את הצבור בעל כרחן - *bais din* does not coerce the public to offer a communal *korbon*. Consequently, explains the Har Ephraim, a lad below the age of twenty is not coerced to contribute a *machatzis hashekel* even though he has a mitzvah to donate.

- The Ramoh¹⁰ cites the custom of giving a half-dollar (or half the standard currency) to tzedakah before [or on] Purim in commemoration of the mitzvah of *machatzis hashekel*. He says that one who is below the age of twenty is exempt from this obligation because, as our Gemara says, those who are under twenty are not coerced to give the *machatzis hashekel*.¹¹

- The Kaf Hachaim¹² writes that in some places the custom is to send the collected *machatzis hashekel* funds to charities in Eretz Yisrael. This is in commemoration of the Bais Hamikdash era when people living outside of Eretz Yisrael would send their *shekalim* to Eretz Yisrael (i.e., to the Bais Hamikdash for the purchase of *korbonos* and other Temple needs).

דף ד.

אע"פ שאמרו אין ממשכנין נשים

אם שקלו מקבלין מהן

The Mishna (halacha 4) says that even though we learned (halacha 3) that children and women are not compelled to donate a *machatzis hashekel*, if they offer to contribute, their contribution is accepted. The Gemara (4a) notes that the Mishna above (halacha 3) indicates that children, although not coerced, are at least asked to donate a half-*shekel* (see above), whereas this Mishna (halacha 4) indicates that there is no attempt at all to solicit a *machatzis hashekel* from children (and women), but rather, it is entirely at their own discretion.

The Gemara answers that the Mishna above refers to soliciting *shekalim* from youngsters who have already reached גדלות (halachic majority), whereas this Mishna refers to קטנים (minors) below the age of thirteen (or before

they sprout (בי שערות).

The Menachem Meishev Nefesh points out that this does not explain the halacha with respect to women. The first Mishna (halacha 3) implies that women are requested to donate, whereas the second Mishna (halacha 4) implies that they are not.

He answers that women are in the same category as children below the age of thirteen and indeed, there is no attempt to solicit a *machatzis hashekel* from women - as the second Mishna indicates. Women are mentioned in the first Mishna only in passing (אגב קטנים), but the inference gleaned from the first Mishna (halacha 3, that *shekalim* are solicited) applies only to boys above the age of thirteen, but not to women.¹³

R' Akiva Eiger,¹⁴ citing the Besamim Rosh, deduces from the fact that women were exempt from *machatzis hashekel* (from which the *korbon musaf* was purchased) that women, evidently, are not obligated to participate in the *musaf*. Consequently, he is of the opinion that women are exempt from *musaf* prayers.

The Be'er Yitzchak¹⁵ argues that according to this line of reasoning, boys below the age of twenty should also be exempt from *musaf*, since they too, were exempt from *machatzis hashekel* (according to the Vilna Gaon's version in the Gemara). Even if we were to say that a person who is exempt from *musaf* has the option of praying (just as he has the option of contributing a *machatzis hashekel*), he certainly lacks the ability to be מוציא (*daven* on behalf of) someone who is halachically obligated to *daven*. Accordingly, a lad below the age of twenty should not be able to serve as the shaliach *tzibur* for *musaf* prayers.¹⁶

The Amudei Ohr¹⁷ argues that even though women were exempt from donating *machatzis hashekel* and thus they did not have a monetary share in the *korbon musaf*, this does not mean that the *korbon* was not offered on their behalf. Since the *korbon musaf* presumably provided atonement for all members of *Klal Yisrael* including women, women should have an obligation to *daven musaf*.¹⁸

דף ה.

בני העיר ששלחו את שקליהם ונגנבו

1] The Mishna (2:1) says that if the people of a town sent their *shekalim* to Yerushalaim with a שליח (courier) who was robbed on the way, the townspeople must donate *shekalim* anew - unless the robbery occurred after the *terumah* (funds for *korbonos*) was separated from the *lishka* (office containing the collected *shekalim*), as will be explained.

The Mishna below (7b) says that *bais din* would perform the act of "*terumas haLishka*" (withdrawal of funds from the *shekalim* chamber for the purchase of *korbonos*) at three designated times during the year. When *bais din* performed this *terumah* (withdrawal of funds for *korbonos*) they would stipulate that even those people whose funds have not yet reached Yerushalaim should also own a share of the funds (so that they too, would have a share in the *korbonos* purchased with that money). [The funds remaining in the *lishka* after *terumas haLishka* was performed, called שיירי הלשכה, were used for other Temple needs (as described in פרק ד' , see below י"ד.)]

Rashi (Bava Metziah 58a) asserts that this stipulation covered, not only those individuals whose *shekalim* were en route to Yerushalaim at the time, but even those whose *shekalim* have been lost - as long as the owners have not yet been apprised of the loss. According to Rashi the townspeople are not obligated to replace the *shekalim* stolen from the courier unless they had been informed of the theft before the *terumah* was performed.

Tosfos are of the opinion that the owners' unawareness of the loss is not significant. According to Tosfos, the stipulation does not apply to anyone whose *shekalim* were lost prior to the *terumah*, even if the owners were not yet informed of the loss at the time.

The Rambam¹⁹ is of the opinion that the stipulation applies only to those who hired a שומר שכר (paid guardian) to take their *shekalim* to Yerushalaim (and only if the *shekalim* were lost due to an אונס - unpreventable accident). However, if the *shekalim* were stolen from, or lost by an unpaid courier, the townspeople are

responsible to replace them, even if it was stolen after the time of the *terumah*.

2] The Gemara (5b) cites Resh Lakish who asserts that one discharges his *machatzis hashekel* obligation as soon as he designates a half-*shekel* for this purpose. If the money is lost or stolen after it was designated, the donor bears no responsibility for it and he need not replace it. Resh Lakish asserts that consecrated money is considered to be in the possession of *hekadesh* (the Temple treasury) wherever it may be - whether it is in the possession of an official *gizbar* (officer) or whether it is still in the hands of a private individual (לה' הארץ ומלוואה).²⁰

The Gemara notes that the Mishna on 5a contradicts Resh Lakish and corresponds with R' Yochanan who maintains that until the half-*shekel* reaches the hands of the *gizbar*, one is responsible to replace it if anything happens to it.

The Gilyon HaShas²¹ notes that even R' Yochanan does not seem to be compatible with our Mishna. The Mishna indicates that one is not responsible for his half-*shekel* if it is lost after the *terumah* was taken, whereas R' Yochanan implies that if one loses his half-*shekel* before giving it to the *gizbar*, he must replace it - even if it was lost after the *terumah* was taken.²²

The Shikleit Yosef²³ points out that according to the Rambam this question is not difficult, for the Mishna does not exempt one from responsibility unless he gave it to a שומר שכר and an אונס occurred. R' Yochanan who says that one is obligated to replace his half-*shekel* that was lost before it reached the *gizbar* is not referring to one who gave his half-*shekel* to a שומר שכר.

דף ו.

כשעלו ישראל מן הגולה היו שוקלין דרכונות

The Mishna relates that during certain periods in history, the community was obligated to contribute more than a half-*shekel* for their annual *machatzis hashekel* dues. When *B'nai Yisrael* returned from Bavel to Eretz Yisrael (to build the second Bais Hamikdash) they were taxed *darkonos* (a *darkon* equals two *shekalim*).

Afterward it was lowered to *selaim*, and finally to *teva'im*. Eventually, they wanted to lower the tax to a *dinar*, which is less than a half-*shekel*, however, this was not permitted because a half-*shekel* is the minimum allowed.

[The Torah states that the *machatzis hashekel* obligation is fixed, העשיר לא ירבה והדל לא ימעט - a rich man should not give more and a poor man should not give less. R' Shimon explains that this posuk mandates a flat tax which does not fluctuate according to one's income. However, it does not rule out raising the tax during certain periods of time, as long as the raise is applied equally to all members of the community.]

There are two approaches to this Mishna:

(a) The Rambam²⁴ opines that the *machatzis hashekel* tax is linked to the standard currency of each generation. Each person is obligated to contribute half of the standard currency unit in use at that time (provided it equals at least a half-*shekel* of the Torah). The Rambam explains that when *B'nai Yisrael* returned to Eretz Yisrael the *darkon* was the standard currency unit in use. Therefore, the *machatzis hashekel* tax was set accordingly - at a half darkon. [The Mishna means that the *darkon* took the place of the *shekel*, and thus they were taxed a half-darkon - instead of a half-*shekel*.]

(b) The Ravad²⁵ argues that when *B'nai Yisrael* returned from Bavel they were an impoverished nation, making it highly unlikely that they would use the costly *darkon* as their currency unit.²⁶ The Ravad explains that the *machatzis hashekel* tax is not linked to the standard currency unit, but rather to the needs of the Temple treasury. At the time of *B'nai Yisrael's* return, the Temple treasury needed a great deal of funds for building the Bais Hamikdash and therefore the tax was raised to a [full] *darkon*. As their needs lessened, the tax was lowered accordingly.²⁷

דף ז.

מותר עני לאותו עני

The Mishna says that if a charity collection was taken up for the needs of poor people and there was a surplus of money amassed, the extra money not needed [now] for the poor people

should be used to assist other poor people [in the future].

However, if money was collected for the needs of a specific poor person, or to ransom a specific captive, any remaining funds should be given to that poor person or to that captive. [Money that is donated towards the needs of a specific person is legally acquired by that person at the time that the money is handed to the גבאי - solicitor.]²⁸

The Mishna further says that leftover money that was collected for the burial needs of a specific dead person should be given to the heirs of the deceased.²⁹

The Gemara considers a case in which it was discovered that the deceased had sufficient money in his estate to pay for all the burial needs.

Rav Idi asserts that this case is different from the Mishna's case in which the extra money is given to the heirs. He asserts that when a person has ample funds to pay for his own burial, the money collected for his burial needs must be returned to the contributors for they never intended to donate to a rich person or to his heirs.

Question: In the case of the Mishna where the person was poor but there is a surplus of funds amassed, we should also say that the donors presumably do not want to give extra money to the poor person.

Two answers:

(a) The Korbon Ho'eidah explains that when the person was initially rich, he never acquires possession of the collected money in the first place, because the money was given for the sake of a poor person, not a rich person. However, if the person was initially poor, he acquires legal possession of all of the collected money at the time of the collection. Once he acquires possession, he is not obligated to return the surplus (even though the contributors presumably would not have wanted him to keep the surplus).

(b) Alternatively, the Taklin Chaditin explains that there is an assumption that the contributors are willing to donate knowing that there is often a surplus. The donors are agreeable to the idea

that the poor person or his heirs will keep the surplus because it is not possible to collect the exact amount needed. Therefore, in the Mishna's case where the principal portion of the money was used to pay for burial needs, the remainder can be given to the heirs. However, in the case of the Gemara where it turned out that the deceased was not in need of any money whatsoever, we assume that the donors would not have been willing to contribute at all. Therefore, it is deemed a mistaken donation and the money must be returned.

2] The Shulchan Aruch³⁰ cites a dispute regarding a captive who died in captivity after money was collected for his release. The Rashba says that the money goes to the captive's heirs, whereas the Rosh³¹ maintains that the money is returned to the contributors.

The Mishnas Eliyahu explains that this dispute is linked to the dispute regarding burial funds. The Rashba understands (as the Korbon Ho'eidah says) the reason a poor person keeps the surplus is that the funds need not be returned once the poor person legally acquired it. In our case, since the captive was in need of the money at the time that it was collected, the captive acquired legal possession of the money at that time. Therefore, if he subsequently dies, the heirs inherit it.

The Rosh, on the other hand, understands (as the Taklin Chaditin says) that a surplus of charity funds may not be retained unless there is an assumption that the donors contributed their money knowing there might a surplus. In the case of the Shulchan Aruch, the money must be returned to the contributors - because the assumption is that had they known how things would turn out (i.e., that the captive would die in captivity) they never would have contributed.

דף ה':

מהו לצאת בין של שביעית

- One may not plant or cultivate his fields during *shmitah* (the Sabbatical year, also called shvi'is).
- During the *shmitah* year one is required to treat his field as הפקר - ownerless - and allow

free access to all who wish to enter and take produce.

The Gemara questions whether one may use יין של שביעית - wine produced [from grapes grown] during the *shmitah* year - for the four cups of wine on Pesach.

The commentators offer several reasons for doubting the suitability of יין של שביעית for the *seder* night:

(a) The Korbon Ho'eidah explains that the Gemara entertains the possibility that there is a requirement of לכם - ownership - regarding wine for the mitzvah of ד' כוסות, just as there is a requirement of "לכם" with respect to *matzah* (and *lulav*). [See Al Hadaf to Pesachim 102b for a discussion about the requirement of לכם with respect to *matzah*.] Since produce grown during *shmitah* is considered *hefker* (ownerless), perhaps *shmitah* wine lacks the requirement of לכם. The Gemara therefore wonders whether one can discharge his obligation of ד' כוסות with such wine.³²

(b) Rabbeinu Meshulam explains that the grapes that grow during *shmitah* are of inferior quality because they grow wild without cultivation. The Gemara therefore questions whether such grapes are suitable for ד' כוסות.

(c) The Har Ephraim, commenting on Rabbeinu Meshulam's *p'shat*, notes that the Mishna in Menachos 86b says that wine made from wild grapes is not fit for נסכים (libation on the *mizbeach*).³³ Also, the Gemara in Bava Basra 97a says that one should not recite kiddush over wine that is unfit for נסכים. Therefore, it is certainly understandable why *shmitah* grapes might not be valid for ד' כוסות.³⁴

(d) In a similar vein, the Ohr Somayach³⁵ cites a Sifri which derives from a posuk, לאכלה (לאכלה) - [shmitah produce] should be eaten - and not burned or used for *nesachim* on the *mizbeach* (where it is burned). Since *shmitah* wine is not valid for *nesachim*, the Gemara questions whether it is valid for ד' כוסות.

(e) Rash Sirilio (i.e., R' Shlomo Sirilio of Spain, circa 1500) explains that eating produce of *shmitah* is a mitzvah as indicated by the posuk לאכלה. Therefore, it is questionable whether it can be used for ד' כוסות since there is a rule that

אין עושין מצות חבילות חבילות - one may not bundle several mitzvos together (Pesachim 102b).³⁶

(f) The Taklin Chaditin explains that the Gemara is referring to *shmitah* wine remaining after the זמן הביעור (latest time for disposal of *shmitah* produce). [The "*z'man ha'biur*" which is a certain cutoff date during the *shmitah* year before which one is obligated to use up or dispose of all *shmitah* produce remaining in his possession. After that point any produce remaining in one's possession is אסור בהנאה - forbidden for benefit - and must be declared *hefker*.] The Gemara questions whether wine remaining in one's possession after *z'man ha'biur* may be used for the sake of ד' כוסות (since "מצות לאו ליהנות ניתנו").³⁷

דף ט. קוץ לא יתרום

1] As we explained above (see דף ה), there were three times during the year when a representative of *bais din* would enter the *lishka* (chamber where the *shekalim* were stored) and perform "*terumas haLishka*" - the act of withdrawing funds from the *shekalim* chamber for the purchase of *korbonos* (see Mishna 7b, 3:1).

The Mishna (8a, halacha 2) says that the representative appointed to perform *terumas haLishka* may not enter the *lishka* (chamber) wearing a garment with a cuff or hem because people might suspect him of stealing *shekalim* concealed in his hem. The Mishna derives from the posuk, Bamidbar 32:22, והייתם נקיים מהי - ומישראל - you shall be innocent before Hashem and before *B'nai Yisrael* - that it is wrong to act in a manner that rouses suspicion.³⁸

R' Yishmael (9a) adds that based on this concept of והייתם נקיים (the obligation to act above suspicion) we do not permit a "קוץ" to perform *terumas haLishka*. The Ravad³⁹ explains that a "קוץ" refers to person with long hair. A long-haired individual should not be appointed to perform *terumas haLishka* because he might be suspected of concealing coins in his hair.⁴⁰

The Rambam⁴¹ suggests another

interpretation of קוּוץ. He says that קוּוץ refers to a very poor person or a beggar who is desperate for money. [The Kesef Mishna explains that the Rambam's text read "קבוץ". This term refers to a beggar who goes from place to place to be "מעוֹת קבוצ" - collect alms). Such a person should not be appointed for the task of *terumas haLishka* because people are likely to suspect him of stealing.

2] וימלא פומיה מים

The Gemara (9a) adds that in order to preclude any grounds for suspicion whatsoever, *bais din* would designate an individual to converse the entire time with the one performing *terumas haLishka*, from the time he enters the *lishka* until he exits, to ensure that he does not slip any money into his mouth.

The Gemara asks why *bais din* doesn't employ an easier method. To prevent the representative from slipping coins into his mouth, *bais din* should fill his mouth with water when he enters and have him empty the water from his mouth when he leaves.

The Gemara answers that this idea is not feasible because he must recite a *bracha*.

The Yefai Mareh⁴² indicates that we are concerned that he might mistakenly swallow some water without reciting a *bracha* (i.e., שהכל נהיה בדברו).

The Chacham Tzvi⁴³ raises two questions:

(a) Before filling his mouth with water we could ask him to recite שהכל נהיה בדברו over a different drink or food and this would exempt him from reciting a *bracha* over the water in the event that he swallows some.

(b) The Gemara (Berachos 45a) says that water requires a *bracha* only when it is drunk to quench one's thirst, but not if it is drunk to clear one's throat (see Al Hadaf *ibid.*). Hence, we should not be concerned about the possibility of the representative swallowing some water since he is not drinking it to quench his thirst.

The Chacham Tzvi, therefore, offers another *p'shat*. He says that the act of תרומת הלשכה - separating the *shekalim* - requires a *bracha* because it is a mitzvah (i.e., ברוך... אשר קדשנו (להפריש תרומה מן הלשכה)). We cannot ask the

representative to fill his mouth with water before entering the room because he is obligated to recite a *bracha* when he performs the mitzvah of *terumas haLishka*.⁴⁴

דף יי

לשון שבין קרני שעיר המשתלה באין משיירי הלשכה

The Mishna on 9b (halacha 1 and the beginning of halacha 2) details which *korbonos* and *korbonos*-related items were purchased with the *terumas haLishka* funds.

The funds remaining in the *lishka* after the *terumas haLishka* funds were separated are called שיירי הלשכה (remaining funds of the *lishka*). These were used for the non-*korbon* needs of the Temple as detailed in the Mishna on 10b (halacha 2).

As described in Vayikra 16 and in the fourth and sixth chapter of Yoma, a pair of identical goats were needed for the Yom Kippur service. Through the drawing of lots they would designate one as the 'שעיר לה' (*korbon* for Hashem to be offered on the *mizbeach*) and one as שעיר לעזאזל - goat to be thrown off a cliff outside of Yerushalaim (also called the שעיר המשתלה). The Mishna in Yoma 41b relates that upon designating the two goats, they would tie a strip of red wool around the neck of the "Hashem goat" to indicate that it was to be slaughtered, and another strip of wool would be tied to the head of the *azazel* goat (שעיר המשתלה). The Mishna there on 67a says that before throwing the *azazel* goat off the cliff, they would divide the strip of wool and tie part of it to its horns and part of it to a rock near the cliff. [Upon throwing the goat off the cliff the strip of red wool would miraculously turn white, signifying forgiveness for their sins.]

The Mishna on 10b (halacha 2) says that the שעיר המשתלה was purchased with *terumas haLishka* funds, but the לשון שבין קרני - the strip of wool between its horns - was purchased with שיירי הלשכה funds.

The Rav (R' Ovadiah of Bartenura) explains that the שעיר המשתלה did not have the status of a *korbon* since it was not offered on the *mizbeach*, and therefore the strip of wool tied to its horns was purchased with שיירי הלשכה funds.

Nevertheless, the שעיר המשתלח itself was purchased with *terumas haLishka* funds because at the time of its purchase (before the lots were cast), it had the potential of being designated as the *korbon* to Hashem. Therefore, both goats were purchased with *terumas haLishka* funds. [The Rav explains that the "לשון של זהורית" mentioned in the beginning of the Mishna (among the items purchased with *terumas haLishka* funds) does not refer to the string tied on to the *azazel* but rather to the red string used with the preparation of a *parah adumah*.]

The Tosfos Yeshanim⁴⁵ offers another approach. He submits that there were two red strips of wool used in connection with the שעיר המשתלח on Yom Kippur. One red string was tied to the head of the שעיר המשתלח to distinguish it from the 'שעיר לה' (which had a string tied around its neck). This string, says the Tosfos Yeshanim, is what the beginning of our Mishna refers to when it says that the לשון של זהורית was purchased with *terumas haLishka* funds. [This string apparently was removed after the 'שעיר לה' was slaughtered.] When the *azazel* goat arrived at the cliff, a different red string was used, half of which was tied to its horns and half to a rock. The second phrase of the Mishna refers to this string when it says that it was purchased with funds from the שיירי הלשכה.

The Har Ephraim explains that even though the שעיר המשתלח did not have the status of a *korbon*, the first red string was purchased with *terumas haLishka* funds because it served a *korbon*-related function by preventing the Hashem goat from getting mixed up with the *azazel* goat. The second red string which was used to indicate forgiveness was purchased with שיירי הלשכה funds because it did not serve a *korbon*-related function.⁴⁶

דף יא.

שחצית גדולה היה בבני כהנים גדולים

- As a precautionary measure to ensure the purity of the people handling the *parah adumah*, a ramp was built for transporting the *parah adumah* from the הר הבית (Temple Mount) to Har Hazeisim (where it was burned).

The ramp shielded these people from contracting tumah from any concealed corpses that might be buried along the route.

The Tanna Kamma of the Mishna (10b) lists this ramp among the Temple items that were purchased with funds from שיירי הלשכה.

Abba Shaul disagrees and asserts that the Kohanim Gedolim would pay for the ramp with their own money.

The Gemara relates that [during the second Temple era when the Kohanim Gedolim were mostly unscrupulous individuals, see Yoma 9a] the ruling Kohen Gadol would insist on constructing a new ramp at the exorbitant cost of sixty gold *kikarim*. R' Chaninah (11a) condemns this practice, claiming that the needless building of expensive new ramps demonstrated great arrogance on the part of these Kohanim.

Ulah notes that Shimon Hatzadik, who was indisputably a righteous Kohen Gadol, processed two *paros adumos* during his term and he built a separate ramp for each one. The Gemara concludes (as explained by the Korbon Ho'eidah and others) that apparently, the practice of building new ramps was not rooted in arrogance (contrary to R' Chaninah's assertion). Rather, building a new ramp was a commendable practice, for it enhanced the respect and honor of the *parah adumah* procedure.

While the Korbon Ho'Eidah, as well as several other commentators, understand that Ulah who approves of Shimon Hatzadik's building of the ramp is in disagreement with R' Chaninah who disapproves of the ramp, Rash Sirilio explains that Ulah agrees with R' Chaninah's criticism of the Kohanim Gedolim who built new ramps instead of using the ramp built by their predecessors. He explains that Shimon Hatzadik's case was an exception because he had to process two *paros adumos* concurrently⁴⁷ and he felt that transporting both cows simultaneously on the same ramp would detract from the honor of the mitzvah. [In fact, says R' Shlomo Sirilio, Shimon Hatzadik did not demolish the preexisting ramp that his predecessor built; he used the old ramp for one

parah adumah and he built one new ramp for the second *parah*.] However, the other Kohanim Gedolim, who demolished the old ramps merely because they wanted to have a new ramp built in their own name, were labeled by R' Chaninah as arrogant individuals.

דף יב עוד בענין הנ"ל

Interestingly, the Chasam Sofer⁴⁸ cites the above cited Gemara (11a) in response to a halachic query regarding a city whose town council vowed they would never demolish and rebuild their town hall (unless they have a compelling need to do so). The Chasam Sofer writes, based on our Gemara, such a vow is deemed *נדר מצוה* (a vow to obey a mitzvah) and cannot be annulled. It is considered inappropriate for a newly-elected town council to waste money on building or renovating the town hall (without a compelling reason). Often times such a decision is motivated by arrogance, as the new council seeks to enhance their own honor by improving on the facilities left by their predecessors.

דף יג. אלו הן הממונים, גביני כרוז

1] The Mishna (13a, halacha 1) lists "Gevini the announcer" among the appointed officers in the Bais Hamikdash. The Gemara (14a) explains that his assignment involved waking up the Kohanim, Levi'im and Yisraelim each morning so that they can prepare for their respective services in the Bais Hamikdash.

The Gemara in Yoma (20b) notes that the Kohen Gadol's voice carried even further than Gevini's voice, for the braysoh relates that the Kohen Gadol's pronouncement of Hashem's ineffable name (ה' אֵלֹהִים) on Yom Kippur was heard in the city of Yericho, which was ten *parsos* from Yerushalaim, whereas Gevini's voice was heard only eight *parsos* away.⁴⁹

Tosfos (Yoma 21a) cite a Mishna in *Tamid* 30b which seems to contradict the Gemara in Yoma (and our Gemara), for the Mishna states that Gevini's voice was heard as far as Yericho, ten *parsos* from Yerushalaim. Tosfos answer that up to a distance of eight *parsos* the words

of Gevini's announcement were heard clearly. In Yericho, the people only heard an echo of Gevini's announcement but they could not discern his words.

The Tosfos Yom Tov⁵⁰ maintains that the Gemara does not mean that the Kohanim Gedolim had more powerful voices than Gevini. Rather, it was the united voices of the entire congregation responding *ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד* (to the Kohen Gadol's pronouncement of Hashem's name) that carried to Yericho.⁵¹

The Ravad⁵² cites his teacher (מורו החסיד) who takes the position that the sounds of the Kohen Gadol and Gevini were heard in Yericho by means of a miracle; their voices were not heard in any other city. This miracle signified that the *kedusha* of Yericho was comparable (in a sense) to the *kedusha* of Yerushalaim, since it was the first city conquered in Eretz Yisrael.

2] The Gemara (14a) relates that King Agrippas once heard Gevini's call at a distance of 8 *parsos* (approx. 20 miles) from the Bais Hamikdash and was so impressed that he granted Gevini many gifts.

The T'shuvos Pri Hasadeh⁵³ was asked by the Rabbi of a certain community whether to discontinue the age old custom of banging and noise-making upon hearing Haman's name read in the Megillah. Certain prestigious members of the community felt that the banging was excessive and was not proper decorum for a *bais haKnesses*.

The Pri Hasadeh responded that by no means should the *minhag* of banging during the megillah, which is mentioned in Shulchan Aruch⁵⁴ and is rooted in kabbalah, be suspended. He cites the Mishna's mention of Gevini's powerful voice as proof that making a lot of noise in a *bais haKnesses*, when done for a valid reason, is not disrespectful. He argues that the reason the Mishna in *Tamid* 30b lists the many sounds of the Bais Hamikdash that were loud enough to be heard even in Yericho, some twenty-five miles from Yerushalaim, is to teach that noise-making in *shul* or in the Bais Hamikdash is sometimes appropriate.

דף יד.

בן בני על הפקיע, שהיה מזייג פתילות

The Mishna (13a) says that Ben Beivai was an officer in the Bais Hamikdash responsible for the "פקיע". The Gemara [Yerushalmi] on 14a explains that "פקיע" means "wicks" - and Ben Beivai was in charge of making the proper-size wicks for the *menorah* in the Bais Hamikdash.

The P'nei Moshe and Rash Sirilio explain that the wicks were made with different thicknesses for different seasons of the year, depending on the length of the night. This is because the Mishna in Menachos (88a) says that they used a half-*log* oil (which equals the volume of three eggs) for each lamp of the *menorah* throughout the entire year, whether winter or summer. The Gemara (ibid., 89a) explains that the sages calculated that a half-*log* oil is the amount necessary for each *menorah* lamp to burn all night on a long winter night (and the posuk teaches that the same amount of oil should be used all year long).

The Yerushalmi (Yoma 2:2, cited by Tosfos in Menachos ibid.) explains that a half-*log* oil would burn twelve hours if it had a wick of average thickness. On the long winter nights they used especially thin wicks so that it would burn longer than twelve hours, and on the short summer nights they used thick wicks lasting less than twelve hours, so that they did not have leftover oil in the morning (see also, Rashi, second *p'shat* ibid.).

Thus, it was Ben Beivai's job to make the proper size wicks for each season, to ensure that the *menorah* would burn until the morning on a long winter night, and that on a short summer night the oil would be used up quickly and there would not be any leftover oil in the morning.⁵⁵

Interestingly, the Gemara in Yoma 23a disagrees with the Yerushalmi's interpretation of the term "פקיע" used by our Mishna. The Gemara (Yoma) concludes that פקיע means "whip". The Gemara explains that it was Ben Beivai's job to circle the Bais Hamikdash grounds with a whip and wake any guard (Levi) who fell asleep at his post.

The Har Ephraim suggests that this dispute is linked to a dispute between the Rambam and

other Rishonim with respect to the daily mitzvah of הטבת הנרות in the Bais Hamikdash.

The Rashba and Rashi⁵⁶ are of the opinion that there was a mitzvah to kindle the *menorah* only in the evening. In the morning, there was a mitzvah, called *haTovas haNeiros*, which called for the Kohanim to clean out the old wicks and oil from the *menorah* (and prepare it for kindling in the evening). Indeed, Rashi (Menachos 89a) indicates there was a mitzvah to discard any leftover oil in the morning.⁵⁷

The Rambam,⁵⁸ however, writes that each morning there was a mitzvah to re-kindle any *menorah* lamp that went out, and the *menorah* lamps that were still burning in the morning were adjusted and allowed to continue burning throughout the day.

According to Rashi there is reason to be concerned about the possibility of having leftover oil in the *menorah* on a short summer night - because we do not want to waste *kodashim* (sacrificial matter). [Also, perhaps we do not want to be in the position of having to extinguish the light of the *menorah* in the event it is still burning in the morning when it is time to clean out the *menorah*.] Thus, it was necessary to appoint an officer over the wicks to ensure that the *menorah* would burn each night until the morning, no more and no less.⁵⁹

According to the Rambam, however, there was no necessity for such a post because the Rambam says that the Kohen did not clean out a *menorah* lamp that was still burning in the morning, but rather, such a lamp remained burning throughout the day. Thus, even if there was leftover oil in the morning (on a short summer night), we did not have to waste *kodashim* or extinguish the *menorah* light (because the lamp remained burning throughout the day).⁶⁰

Thus, the Rambam⁶¹ rules as the Gemara in Yoma concludes, that the job of Ben Beivai was not to make wicks, but to wake the Levi'im who were caught sleeping on their job.⁶²

דף טו.

וישכח ישראל את עושהו ויבן היכלות

1] The Gemara relates that R' Chama bar Chaninah once proudly showed R' Hoshea some

beautiful synagogues that his ancestors built in the city of Lod, exclaiming, "look how much money my ancestors enshrined here." Unimpressed, R' Hoshea responded, "look how many lives your ancestors buried here!" Rather than beautifying the synagogues, R' Hoshea argued that the money should have been spent in supporting Torah scholars. [The Korbon Ho'eidah explains that R' Hoshea knew for a fact that during the period when the synagogues were built or renovated, there were poor Torah scholars who suffered from a lack of support and were unable to study.]

The Gemara relates a similar incident in which R' Avun pridefully showed R' Mana the beautiful entranceway to a large bais hamedrash that he built. Unimpressed, R' Mana cited the posuk in Hoshea (8:14), וישכח ישראל את עושהו - ויבן היכלות - Israel forgot its creator and built palaces. R' Mana felt that R' Avun's tzedakah money would have been better spent supporting Torah scholars.

The Maharam of Rothenburg⁶³ deals with one who promised to donate money to charity without designating a specific cause, and afterward he considered using the money to purchase lights for a *bais haKnesses*. Based on our Gemara, the Maharam advised this individual to better donate his money to poor Torah scholars and to needy sick people.⁶⁴

2] The Ahavas Tzion⁶⁵ infers from the above Gemara (15b) that a person of limited means should distribute most of his charity funds to the poor and to support Torah study, rather than towards the construction of resplendent synagogues. Large donations towards the construction of beautiful *shul* buildings should be given only by individuals of considerable means who will not be compelled to turn away the poor because of a prior donation towards the building of a *shul*.

Based on this, the Ahavas Tzion explains the following passage in Divrei Hayamim. The posuk (Divrei Hayamim I:29) relates that Dovid Hamelech accumulated a great deal of funds and material for the Bais Hamikdash which was eventually built by his son Shlomo. The posuk

(ibid. v. 9) states that the people were delighted regarding their donations, for they contributed with an open heart, and Dovid Hamelech also rejoiced greatly. The Ahavas Tzion⁶⁶ explains the reason for this great rejoicing was that the people in that generation were very wealthy and they were able to afford to make large donations to the Bais Hamikdash without diminishing their donations to the poor and needy. Had they not been so wealthy, it would have been wrong of them to make such large donations. Hence, they had a special reason to rejoice since they were wealthy enough to support both causes, the building of the Bais Hamikdash and the poor and needy.

Interestingly, although the money for the Bais Hamikdash was initially donated in an appropriate manner, according to the *midrash*, the funds were not appropriately administered. The posuk in Melachim I:7:51 states that after Shlomo Hamelech completed the building of the Bais Hamikdash, he stockpiled his father's consecrated gold and silver in storehouses. Rashi (ibid.) cites an opinion from the *midrash* that Shlomo refused to build the Bais Hamikdash with the funds that his father amassed. During Dovid Hamelech's reign there was a severe hunger in the land for a period of three years. Shlomo Hamelech felt that these funds were tainted because they should have been distributed during the three-year hunger to feed the starving masses.

דף טז.

אין מושחין מלך בן מלך אלא מפני המחלוקת

- The שמן המשחה (anointing oil) was made by Moshe Rabbeinu and was used to anoint the vessels of the *Mishkan* as well as to anoint Aaron and his sons.

The Gemara says that the *shemen ha'mishcha* was required to anoint מלכי בית דוד (kings from the house of David) but not for מלכי ישראל (kings from other tribes of Israel).⁶⁷

Also, *shemen ha'mishcha* was required only for a Davidic king who is the first of his family to become king, such as Dovid Hamelech. However, the son of a king inherits the monarchy from his father and does not require

anointing. [This is in contrast to Kohanim Gedolim where the law is that all Kohanim Gedolim must be anointed. Even though as a rule, the son of a Kohen Gadol is given his father's post (if he is fit to serve), it is not considered an inherited post, and therefore, each new Kohen Gadol must be anointed.]⁶⁸

The Gemara asks why Shlomo was anointed upon succeeding his father Dovid, since we learned that the son of a king does not need to be anointed.

In answer, the Gemara postulates that in cases of מחלוקת (dispute or contention) even a king who succeeds his father's throne must be anointed. The Meiri explains that when there is a dispute of the son's right to the throne, he is anointed with the *shemen ha'mishcha* to publicize that he is rightfully the king (and this will hopefully silence his detractors).

The Avnei Nezer⁶⁹ asks why the *shemen ha'mishcha* may be used just because the monarchy is disputed. The Gemara says with respect to מלכי ישראל, the *shemen ha'mishcha* may never be used, even in cases of dispute where the anointing might help quell the dispute. The Gemara indicates that using *shemen ha'mishcha* merely to silence a dispute is a prohibited act of מעילה בהקדש (misuse of items of *hekdesh*).

In answer, the Avnei Nezer cites the Rambam who indicates that the Gemara permits the use of *shemen ha'mishcha* on the son of a king only if there is a dispute between the king and his brothers as to who should inherit the throne. He explains that although as a rule the throne is inherited by the oldest brother, if a younger brother is more fit to rule, or is more popular with the masses, a younger brother could inherit the throne. Thus, suggests the Avnei Nezer, the reason *shemen ha'mishcha* is used in the case of a family dispute, is that the inheritance of the throne is not 100% clear, and is subject to change. If one son is selected due to his age, prestige or popularity and then subsequently another son gains popularity, the second son could claim that he is the correct heir to the throne. Therefore, in such a case of a family dispute, they had to anoint the appointed

king, to ensure that he remains on the throne and that his brothers do not continuously try to prove that they are the correct heir.

Alternatively, the Avnei Nezer suggests that the throne can be inherited only in conjunction with popular consent of the masses. If the throne was originally contested (even if by outsiders) and many people did not originally consent to the rule of this king, then he could not assume the throne. This would mean that the son of the previous king, in such a case, did not inherit the throne at the time of his father's death. Once he did not inherit the throne at the moment of death, he can only assume the throne via anointment with *shemen ha'mishcha*, and no longer through inheritance (because inheritance can take effect only at the moment of death).

דף יז:

עשרה שולחנות עשה שלמה

The posuk in Divrei Hayamim (II:4:7,8, cited on 17b) says that Shlomo Hamelech made ten *shulchanos* in the Bais Hamikdash. The posuk (ibid. 4:7, cited on 18a) also says that Shlomo Hamelech made ten *menoros*. The Gemara explains that these were in addition to the original *shulchan* and *menorah* used in the time of Moshe Rabbeinu (in the *mishkan*).

The Gemara cites one opinion that asserts that Shlomo used only the original *shulchan* and *menorah* from Moshe Rabbeinu's time; the other ten were just for display. R' Yosi ben Yehuda⁷⁰ disagrees and maintains that Shlomo Hamelech's ten *shulchanos* and *menoros* were used (in addition to Moshe's).

Rashi (Menachos 99a) explains that R' Yosi does not mean that they lit all eleven *menoros* daily and placed *lechem hapanim* on all the *shulchanos* simultaneously. Rather, he means that they alternated between them, sometimes using one and sometimes another.

The Meshech Chachma,⁷¹ citing a *Midrash* from Yalkut Shimoni,⁷² says contrary to Rashi, that they actually would kindle all eleven *menoros* each day, and each week they placed *lechem hapanim* on each of the eleven *shulchanos* (just that Moshe's *menorah* and *shulchan* were used first). The Meshech

Chachma suggests the reason Shlomo made an additional ten *menoros* for the Bais Hamikdash was that the Bais Hamikdash had [more than] eleven times more airspace than the *Mishkan*. [The *Mishkan* was 30 *amos* long x 10 *amos* wide x 10 *amos* high = 3,000 cubic *amos*, whereas the Bais Hamikdash was 60 *amos* long x 20 wide x 30 high = 36,000 cubic *amos*.] Therefore, Shlomo felt that while one *menorah* provided sufficient light for the *mishkan*, eleven *menoros* were needed for the Bais Hamikdash.⁷³ Each *menorah* required a corresponding *shulchan* because the posuk (Sh'mos 40:24) states that the *menorah* should be placed in the sanctuary opposite the *shulchan*. Therefore, Shlomo also made ten *Shulchanos*.

דף יח.

עשר מנורות עשה שלמה

As stated above, the posuk in Divrei Hayamim states that Shlomo Hamelech made ten *menoros* in addition to Moshe's *menorah*. According to the *midrash* (cited above) all eleven *menoros* were used daily.

The Yad Dovid⁷⁴ asks why lighting more than one *menorah* each day (arranging multiple sets of *lechem hapanim* on multiple *shulchanos*) is not a violation of the *issur* of *בל תוסיף* (adding to the *mitzvos* of the Torah). Furthermore, he notes that using extra *lechem hapanim* and kindling extra *menoros* which are not necessary for the *mitzvah* should be forbidden under the *issur* of *בזרה* (bringing and offering unconsecrated items in the Bais Hamikdash).

The Yad Dovid answers that apparently it was not Shlomo Hamelech's own idea to use the extra *menoros* and *shulchanos*, but rather he did so under the direction of a *navi*. The posuk in Divrei Hayamim (I:28:19) indicates that all the instructions for the building of the Bais Hamikdash were delivered by a *navi* (הכל בכתב), (מיד ה' וגו'). Apparently, Shlomo Hamelech was directed by a *navi* to construct (and use) ten *shulchanos* and *menoros*.

The Yad Dovid says, however, that he doesn't believe that the extra *menoros* and *shulchanos* were used on Shabbos, because that

would involve chillul Shabbos.

Rabbeinu Bachya⁷⁵ suggests that the extra ten *menoros* are alluded to in the posuk *תיעשה המנורה* (the *menorah* should be made, *ibid.* v.31). The extra letter "י" (yud) in the word *עשה* alludes to the ten extra *menoros* that Shlomo would eventually make for the Bais Hamikdash (because the *gematria* - numerical value - of the letter yud is ten). R' Bachya says that Hashem explicitly informed Moshe of this halacha, and it was handed down from generation to generation until Shlomo Hamelech's times.

דף יט:

מעות שנמצאו לפני סוחרים בהמה לעולם מעשר

• *Maaser sheni* (the second-tithe) must be taken to Yerushalaim and eaten there. However, one may redeem *maaser sheni* produce with money by transferring the *kedusha* from the produce to money. The money then is taken to Yerushalaim instead of the produce, and is used there to purchase produce or animals.

• When the *maaser sheni* money is given to a merchant for produce or animals, the *maaser sheni kedusha* shifts from the money to the produce. [The produce acquires the status of *maaser sheni* and the money become *chullin*.]

The Mishna (19a, halacha 2) says that if one finds money near an animal dealer in Yerushalaim he must consider it *maaser sheni* money. This halacha is based on the fact that *רוב* - the majority - of animals purchased in Yerushalaim throughout the entire year were purchased with *maaser sheni* funds. [This is because the *עולי רגל* (pilgrims who came for the festivals) would bring an abundance of *maaser sheni* funds to Yerushalaim and whatever funds they were unable to use would be left with people in Yerushalaim who would use it to buy animals (for *korbonos*) throughout the year.] Based on the principle of *הלוך אחר רוב*, we assume that money found in the proximity of an animal dealer came from *רוב* - the larger group - which is *maaser sheni* funds.

Tosfos in Pesachim 7a ask that even if most of the money used to purchase animals is *maaser sheni* funds this does not mean that

most of the money in the proximity of an animal dealer is *maaser sheni*. Tosfos point out that the *kedusha* of the *maaser sheni* funds is transferred to the animal at the time of the purchase. Presumably, it is just as likely for a merchant to lose his money as it is for one of the buyers. Consequently, it is difficult to understand why the Gemara assumes that רוב of the money in the area is *maaser sheni*.

In answer, Tosfos says that since there are more buyers than sellers the rule of הלוך אחר רוב says that we must presume that one of the many buyers lost the money, not the single merchant (see Korbon Ho'eidah here and see next daf).

דף כ. עוד בענין רוב

If one finds meat in a city in which there are nine kosher butcher stores and one non-kosher butcher store, the Gemara says (19b) that we apply the principle of רוב which says that one may assume that the meat originated from a kosher store since the majority of the stores in the city sell kosher meat.

The Chachmas Odam⁷⁶ maintains that the determining factor is the quantity of meat, not the number of stores.⁷⁷ If the non-kosher butcher store contains more meat than all the kosher butcher stores combined, then meat which is found must be presumed as non-kosher.

The Chavos Daas⁷⁸ disagrees and maintains that the determining factor is the number of stores. Even if the non-kosher butcher handles most of the city's meat, one who finds meat in the street may assume that it came from one of the nine kosher stores.⁷⁹

[The Bais Ephraim⁸⁰ agrees with the Chachmas Odam that רוב depends on the amount of meat, however, he argues that the critical factor is the amount of meat that was sold (on the day that the meat was found). He argues that the amount of meat stored in the butcher's freezer is irrelevant because that meat was definitely not the meat that was found in the street.]

The Dvar Shmuel (Pesachim 7a) notes that Tosfos (mentioned above on דף יט) seems to

support the position of the Chavos Daas. Tosfos says that even though more than fifty percent of the money in the proximity of an animal dealer is *chullin*, we must assume that money found there is *maaser sheni* because the majority of people in that area carry *maaser sheni* money. Similarly, says the Dvar Shmuel, in the case of butcher stores the determining factor should be the number of stores not the amount of meat.⁸¹

In defense of the Chachmas Odam, the Dvar Shmuel explains that when Tosfos says that there are more buyers than sellers he means that there are several prospective buyers examining and bidding for each animal. Since each prospective buyer is carrying *maaser sheni* money, there is more *maaser sheni* money in the area than *chullin* money.⁸²

דף כא: פרוכת שלש מאה כהנים מטבילין אותו

The Mishna tells of the enormous size and weight of the curtain in the Bais Hamikdash (which divided the Heichal from the קודש הקדשים - Holy of Holies). It was forty *amos* (cubits) high, twenty *amos* wide, and one *tefach* (handbreadth) thick. They would make two new curtains every year, and three hundred Kohanim were needed to immerse them. [The Rav, citing a Mishna in Chagigah 20b, explains that all new utensils for the Bais Hamikdash required immersion in the *mikveh* before use.]

The Gemara comments that this is one of the few places where the Mishna speaks in exaggerated terms (גזומא). The Mishna chooses the number three hundred merely to emphasize that the curtain was very heavy, but it does not mean that three hundred Kohanim were actually needed to immerse it.

Even though the Gemara says that the Mishna speaks in exaggerated terms, the Vilna Gaon⁸³ explains that there is a reason why the Mishna specifically chose the number "three hundred." As stated above, the curtain was forty *amos* long by twenty *amos* wide, meaning that its perimeter measured 120 *amos*. R' Yehuda (Keilim 17:10) asserts that although a standard amah equals six *tefachim*, when

measuring the Bais Hamikdash vessels they used a smaller amah of only five *tefachim*. Hence, the perimeter of the Bais Hamikdash curtain was 600 *tefachim* (120 x 5 *tefachim* = 600 *tefachim*). Accordingly, three hundred is the maximum number of Kohanim that could simultaneously grasp the edges of the curtain [with both hands] since a typical hand is one *tefach* wide (i.e., 300 Kohanim x 2 hands each = 600 *tefachim*). Even though it was not actually necessary to have so many Kohanim hold the curtain, the Mishna, wanting to emphasize its large size, chose a number that represents the maximum number of Kohanim that could simultaneously hold the curtain.⁸⁴

The Yefai Einayim⁸⁵ finds fault with this calculation, noting that R' Yehuda says in the Mishna in Keilim *ibid.* that only the כלים - vessels - of the Bais Hamikdash were measured with five-*tefach amos*, but the בנין - structure - of the Bais Hamikdash was measured with standard six-*tefach amos*. Hence, the dimensions of the curtain were 40 six-*tefach amos* by 20 six-*tefach amos* because the curtain was part of the structure of the Bais Hamikdash. [Moreover, its function was to divide the Heichal from the Kodesh HaKodashim and the opening between them was 40 six-*tefach amos* high by 20 six-*tefach amos* wide.] Accordingly, the perimeter of the curtain was 720 *tefachim* (120 x 6 *tefachim*), not 600 *tefachim*.

דף כב.

גר בזה"ז צריך להביא קינו ריבעית כסף

- The Gemara in Kreisos 9a says that גירות (conversion) in the time of the Bais Hamikdash involved a three-step process - *milah*, *tevilah* and *korbon*. [The conversion must take place in the presence of *bais din* and the *ger* must accept all the mitzvos of the Torah.]
- A braysoh, cited by the Gemara there, states that a *ger* may not partake in *kodashim* until he brings his *korbon*. The Gemara also says that the convert's *korbon* serves to permit him to enter the קהל ה' (Jewish community.)
- The Gemara (*ibid.*) infers from a posuk (וכי... לדורותיכם יגור אתכם גר...) that today when

bringing a *korbon* is not possible, גירות is effected with *milah* and *tevilah* alone.

The Gemara (22a) cites a braysoh which says that a *ger* who converts today must designate money for a *korbon* to be offered when the Bais Hamikdash will be rebuilt (with the coming of Mashiach). The Gemara says, however, that R' Yochanan b' Zakai discontinued this practice because of a concern that one may inadvertently use the designated sanctified money for personal use and thereby violate the *issur* of מעילה בהקדש (misappropriation of *hekdesh* funds).

Although R' Yochanan b' Zakai decreed that *gerim* today should not designate money for a *korbon*, the Rambam⁸⁷ rules that they will be obligated to bring a *korbon* when the Bais Hamikdash will be rebuilt.

The Avnei Nezer⁸⁸ considers whether a *ger*, upon the rebuilding of the Bais Hamikdash, will be prohibited from partaking in *kodashim* prior to bringing his *korbon*.

The Avnei Nezer deduces from the fact that a *ger* today is permitted to marry a bas Yisrael after he performs just *milah* and *tevilah*, that *milah* and *tevilah* effect a total conversion. Consequently, he argues that when the Bais Hamikdash will be rebuilt *gerim* will be permitted to eat *kodashim* even prior to their *korbon* because the *korbon* of a *ger* is not essential to the completion of his conversion.

The Zecher Yitzchak⁸⁹ notes that Tosfos in Kreisos (9a, ד"ה צריך שיפריש רובע) indicate to the contrary, that upon the rebuilding of the Bais Hamikdash *gerim* will require a *korbon* to complete their conversion. Tosfos indicates that not only will a *ger* be prohibited from eating *kodashim* before offering a *korbon*, he will also be prohibited from marrying a bas Yisrael. Even though a *ger* who converts in present times is permitted to marry a bas Yisrael upon performing just *milah* and *tevilah*, when the Bais Hamikdash will be rebuilt this permission will be revoked until he brings a *korbon*.⁹⁰

דף ב

(26) שם בהשגות (וכן דעת הרמב"ן עה"ת פ"ר כי תשא).
(27) ע"י כסף משנה סוף ה"ו שהקשה על טענת הראב"ד - אטו מפני שהם עניינים לא יתכן שיהיה להם מין מטבע גדולי עכ"ל.
(28) ע"י רש"י כאן (פ"ב מ"ד) מה שהקי על הרמב"ם והעלה כדעת הראב"ד.

דף ג

(29) ועי' יו"ד סימן רנ"ח ס"ו ובפ"ת שם סק"ז בענין נדרי צדקה ד"א דאמרינן אמירתו לגבוה כמסירתו להדיוט ותו א"א לחזור בו אפי' תוכ"ד, ועי' קצוה"ח סימן רי"ב סק"ד ומחנ"א ה"ל צדקה פ"ב.
(30) ע"י שו"ת הרשב"א סימן שע"ה (מובא ברמ"א בחו"מ סוף סימן ר"י) שמדייק מכאן דשייך קנין למת בדברים שהן לצורך קבורתו וכבודו, ועי' גמ' סנהדרין דף מח. דמותר לירושו משום "דאחולי אחיל המת זילותה לגבי ירושיו" (ויש לפרש הטעם דצריכין לסברא זו משום דלא שייך ירושה על דבר שאדם קנה אחר מיתתו).
(31) יו"ד סימן רנ"ג סעיף ז'
(32) שו"ת הרא"ש כלל ל"ב ס"ו ו' (ע"ש) דהנידון שם היה שנקבצו מעות בשביל שבי א' ואח"כ נודע להן שכבר נטמע השבוי בין העכו"ם ותו לא היה שייך לפדותו.

דף ה

(33) ע"י רש"י סוף ערבי פסחים (על ירושלמי פרק ערבי פסחים) שהקי על הקרבן העדה מהא דמבואר בפרק לולב הגזול דיוצאין בלולב של שביעית (אם נתן לו במתנה) אע"ג דלולב ודאי בעינן לכס (וכן הקי השקלי יוסף כא').
(34) מבואר שם דהיו מביאין נסכים מן הכרמים ומפרש שם בברייתא (דף פז). דהיינו מכרמים הנעבדים פעמיים בשנה.
(35) ומבאר שם דהטעם דמסקינן דיין של שביעית כשר לדי' כוסות משום דגבי נסכים כשר בדיעבד אפי' יין שנעשה מענבים שלא נעבדו פעמיים בשנה, וממילא לגבי קידוש כשר אפי' לכתחילה.
(36) פרק כ"ט מהל' שבת ה"ל כ"ד.
(37) כך מבאר השקלי יוסף כוונתו, ועי' בהר אפרים שמעורר שפליגי הראשונים אי יש קיום מצוה באכילת פירות שביעית, דהרמב"ן ס"ל דהוי מצוה (בהוספות על ספ"ה"מ להרמב"ם מ"ע ג' בסוף ספ"ה"מ), והרמב"ם לכאוי' חולק וס"ל דלאכלה לאו לענין מצוה נאמרה אלא לאסור סחורה.
(38) הטעם להיתר משום מצות לאו ליהנות ניתנו (ועי' בשקלי יוסף מה שהקי ע"ז), ועי' בספר "מחקק ספון".

דף ט

(39) ע"י בשו"ת דברי מלכאל ח"ד סימן ס"א ד"ה הנה יש בזה שמבאר כמה פרטים בנוגע לדין והייתם נקיים.
(40) בהשגותיו על הרמב"ם וסוף פ"ב מהל' שקלים, וכך פ"י הקרבן העדה.
(41) נסתפקתי אם עסקינן דוקא משערות הראש, או גם אם שערות זקנו (או פיאות הראש) ארוכים מדי אין מניחים אותו לתרום הלישכה, (ולכאוי' מבאר מתוך שו"ת דברי מלכאל הנ"ל ד"ה והנה בבי"ג דעסקינן בשערות הראש דוקא שכי' שם דהטעם דקוץ לא יתרום משום ששינה מכפי הרגיל שאין רגילות בכהנים שיהא קוץ דכתיב שלא יגדלו פרעו ל' יום, ודו"ק).
(42) שם, בסוף פ"ב מהל' שקלים, ועי' בכס"מ שכי' דרמב"ם גרס **קבוץ** (בבב"ת, ולא קוץ) שהוא לשון עני שהוא מקבץ ממקום למקום.
(43) (ספר קדמון על אגדות תלמוד ירושלמי, והוא מבעל המחבר "יפה תואר" על מדרש רבה), ועי' ש שהקי מהא דתנן כאן (פ"ג ה"ג) דאינו תורם עד שיאמר אתרום, ואם היה ממלא פיו איך היה מדבר (ותי' דאולי סגי ברמיזה ולא צריך דיבור דוקא).
(44) סימן קכ"א.

(45) ע"י ב"תורתן של ראשונים" (נדפס בסוף שקלים בש"ס ירושלמי) שהביא בשם שו"ת הרשב"א ח"א ס"ו י"ח שכי' דאין מברכין על נתינת מתנת כהונה משום דאין הישראל נותן משלו אלא שהשם יתברך זכה אותן לכהן ומשולחן גבוה קא זכו, וכן נתינת שקל כדכתיב כי ממך הכל ומיך נתון לך, ע"ש, משמע קצת מהא דהביא הרשב"א דהבין התורתן של ראשונים דלדברי הרשב"א אין מברכין על הפרשת תרומת הלישכה, וכן הבין המגיה על החכם צבי (רי' חיים אייזיק טיקוצקי, דפוס ירושלים שנת תשנ"ה), אולם לכאוי' דברי הרשב"א לא שייכי כאן, דלא כתב הרשב"א אלא שאין הישראל מברך בשעת נתינת השקל אבל מודה שהשליח ב"ד מברך בשעת **שתורם** את הלשכה כמו שמברכין בשעת הפרשת מעשרות (כדמבואר בכמה מקומות וכדמבאר הרשב"א בעצמו שם), וכן העיר הבעל "פשר דבר" כאן.

דף י

(46) על מסי' יומא דף סז. סוד"ה חולק לשון (נדפס בגליון הגמ' שם ריש דף סח:), ועי' בסמ"ג מצוה עשה מ"ה ומצות עשה ר"ט ד"ג"כ כתוסי ישנים מבואר שהיו שם ב' לשונות אי' קשרו בשעת הגורל ואחרת קשרו כשהגיעו לראש החר.

(1) עי' בהג' חשק שלמה (נדפס בסוף מסי' שקלים בש"ס בבלי דפוס ווילנא) שנתמה למה צריכין תרתי קריאת פרשת שקלים וגם הכרות שלוחי ב"ד.
(2) ע"ש בשם הילקוט ובשם תוסי' במגילה דף טז. שדקדק המן לשקול י' אלף ככר כסף שהיה עולה כנגד כל השקלים ששקלו ישראל במדבר.
(3) על פי המהרש"א מגילה דף י"ג ע"ב.

דף יא

(4) הרוקח הוא בסימן רל"ג (ועי' ברש"י במנחות דף מו: ד"ה שאינו שוקל דמבואר דאינו חייב לשקול עד בן כ').
(5) הלכות שקלים פ"א ה"ז
(6) לר' אפרים גרבוז, נדפס ביחד עם פירוש ר' שלמה סיריליאנו, בירושלים שנת תשי"ח).
(7) עי' קה"ל עמ"ס זבחים ס"ד שג"כ כתב שיש ב' דינים בנתינת שקלים (אבל כתב בנוסח אחר קצת, ע"ש), [עי' ספר החינוך ריש מצוה ק"ה דמשמע שזהו עיקר מצותו שיתנו כ"א מחצית השקל כדי שיהא להם חלק בקרבנות, וברמב"ם בפ"א מהל' שקלים לא נזכר טעם זה למצות שקלים].

(8) כן מבואר להדיא ברש"י שם במנחות דף מו: דפחות מבן כ' פטור מלשקול כיון דאינו ראוי
(9) לויקד, ועי' בספר "שקל הקודש" (להג' ר' חיים קניבסקי) פ"א ס"ק מ"ח שנסתפק לדעה זו אם גם יותר מבן ששים פטור כיון שגם הן לא נמנו כדמשמע בב"ב דף קכא. כיון דאינן בכלל יוצא צבא וגם נסתפק אם כהנים ולוים חייבים לשקול אפי' כשהן פחותים מבן כ' שנה כיון שהן נמנו מבן חודש ולמעלה, (אגב, עי' בר' שלמה סיריליאנו שמבאר דלדעת הרמב"ם צ"ל דהא דכתיב בפרשת שקלים מבן עשרים ולמעלה אזיל דוקא על תרומת אדנים שבזמן ההוא).
(10) פרשת אמור פרשה ז' (ע"פ פ"י ר"ש משאנ"ץ שם, אולם ע"ש בראב"ד שכי' דגם בקרבנות ציבור כופין כמו לגבי יחיד).
(11) או"ח סימן תרצ"ד ס"א (ועי' שהביא בשם המרדכי מנהג ליתן ג' חצאי שקלים).

(12) משמע בדברי הרמ"א דעל בן י"ג ליכא חיוב כלל, ולפי ההר אפרים י"ל דבזה"ז כשליכא קרבנות המנהג של נתינת מחצית השקל אינו אלא כנגד דין ראשון (דהיינו החיוב של זה יתנו, ולכך ליכא חיוב כלל על פחות מבן כ'), אולם עי' בחינוך ריש מצוה ק"ה דמדויק דס"ל דליכא חיוב כלל על פחות מבן כ' (אפי' בזמן הבית).
(13) סימן תרצ"ד ס"ק כ"ב (ועי' שם מש"כ בענין המנהג לתת ג' חצאי שקלים משום דכתיב "תרומה" ג' פעמים בפרשה, והקי' הכף החיים הרי אפי' בזמן המקדש לא היו נותנין אלא פעם א').

דף יב

(14) עי' מחוקק ספון שהקי' אטו תנינן תרתי (נשים ועבדים) אטו חדא (קטנים) כדמסקינן בריש קדושין, ועי' מה שתירץ.
(15) מ"ק סימן ט'
(16) סוף סימן כ'.
(17) (הוספה זו מדברי התורה תמימה ריש פרשת כי תשא סוף אות כ"ב, ומסיים דזהו יחוד משום נפלא מאד לומר שאין לאיש פחות מבן כ' לעבור לפני התיבה לתפלת מוספין), והנה כמובן דלפי גירסת הגר"א במכילתין ולפי ביאור ההר אפרים לק"מ מבן י"ג, שהרי לפי דבריו באמת הוא חייב ליתן בעד המוסף אלא דאין כופין אותו משום דכתיב לרצונכם, ולפי"ז בן י"ג ודאי חייב בתפילת מוסף.

(18) סימן ז'
(19) ועי' "אסוף שמן" (להר' שלמה אהרן וינער שליט"א) סימן ג' מש"כ בזה ביאור רחב, ועי' בזרע אברהם סימן ד' סק"כ שדן אם נשים מתכפרות, והנה ע"ש בעמודי אור שמסיק דנשים פטורות מצד אחר משום דהוי מצות עשה שזמן גרמא (והא דחייבות בתפילה אינו אלא משום דבעי רחמים כדאיתא שם בברכות וסברא זו לא שייך במוסף) וכ"כ הצ"ח רפ"ד דברכות, ועי' משנ"ב סימן ק"ו סק"ד שהביא והצ"ח וכתב דהמנן גיבורים חולק וס"ל דנשים חייבות במוסף.

דף יג

(20) פ"ג מהל' שקלים ה"ל ח' וט'.
(21) וצ"ל דמאחר שבא הממון לרשות הקדש יש לכולן יד שוה בכל השקלים וממילא יש לו חלק בקרבנות אפי' אם אח"כ נאבד שקלו (וצב"ק כיון שעדיין לא נתערב שקלו בשאר שקלים).
(22) [הנדפס בגליון תלמוד ירושלמי, נתחבר ע"י בעל שו"ת "שואל ומשיב" (ר' יוסף שאול נאטאנואה) ביחד עם גיסו הר' מרדכי זאב איטינגא].
(23) כ"כ הקרבן העדה להדיא.
(24) (מאת הר' יוסף צבי אהרנזאהן) בחידושים והערות בסוף הספר, פרק ב' ה"א.
דף יד
(25) פ"א מהל' שקלים הלכה ה' ו'.

דף	This Al Hadaf was made possible by the following daf dedications...	יום
ב	לז"נ הר"י משה מנחם בן אשר רוזלר ז"ל * - הונצח ע"י חתנו ובתו משה ורבקה שרייבר נ"י	Fri כא אייר
ג		שבת כב אייר
ח		Thrs כז אייר
ט	לז"נ מו"ר הר"י שלמה זלמן בן סיני Gombo ז"ל * מאת תלמידו מאיר הערץ שטיינמעטץ נ"י	Fri כח אייר
י		שבת כט אייר
יא		Sun א סיון
יב		Mon ב סיון
יג	לז"נ הרב דוב בן דוד מאיר ז"ל * from Shari & Jay Gold and Family	Tues ג סיון
יד	לז"נ ר' שלמה זלמן ב"ר שמעון Glick ז"ל * לז"נ חיה ליבא בת יב"ל שלמה *	Wed ד סיון
טו	לז"נ ר' שלמה בן יוסף הלוי נוסבוים ז"ל * לז"נ אמי מורתי חשא פיגא בת ר' שלום יוסף ניימאן ע"ה *	Thrs ה סיון
טז	לז"נ אמי מורתי מלכה ביילא בת שמאי משה Bienenstock ז"ל *	Fri א שבועות
יז		שבת ב שבועות
יח	לז"נ משה בן יעקב מיכאל ז"ל *	Sun ח סיון
יט	לז"נ דבורה בת יצחק הלוי ז"ל - In memory of DOROTHY LANE * לז"נ מלכה בת אברהם ז"ל *	Mon ט סיון
כ	לז"נ חיה בת ר' אלחנן שמחה ז"ל * IDA STERN	Tues י סיון
כא		Wed יא סיון
כב	לז"נ אברהם בן פתחיה ז"ל (יא"צ ד' סיון) ולז"נ פייגא בת ישראל ז"ל *	Thrs יב סיון

* Denotes Yartzeit

Cong. Al Hadaf
P.O. Box 791
Monsey, NY 10952
Ph. & Fx. 845-356-9114
cong_al_hadaf@yahoo.com

(c) 2006 Not to be reproduced in any form whatsoever without permission from publisher. Published by; Cong. Al Hadaf/ P.O. Box 791/ Monsey, NY 10952. Rabbi Zev Dickstein - Editor. For subscription, dedication, or advertising information. contact the office at 845-356-9114, Email:cong_al_hadaf@yahoo.com, or go to www.alhadafyomi.org