

5 Kislev 5774
Nov. 8, 2013



Shekalim Daf 21

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The *Mishna* says that while there is no *Kohen Gadol*, the *chavitin* offering was offered as a full *isaron*, and not halved.

Rabbi Yochanan asks whether the full *isaron* was offered in the morning and in the afternoon, or was it brought in the morning and nothing was brought in the afternoon.

The *Gemora* notes that if you would resolve that it is brought both in the morning and in the afternoon, for it is written: a *minchah* offering, continually (and therefore it cannot be suspended in the afternoon), then when it says that three *lugin* of oil accompany the *Kohen Gadol's* *minchah*, is there (when there is no *Kohen Gadol* and a whole *isaron* is offered both in the morning and in the afternoon), three *lugin* in the morning and three in the afternoon, or is it a *lug* and a half in the morning and a *lug* and a half in the afternoon?

Rabbi Chizkiyah said: We must inquire about the following as well: [Regarding the *levonah* spice (*frankincense*) offered with the *chavitin* of a live *Kohen Gadol*, Abba Yossi ben Dostai says that two fistfuls are offered, one with the morning half, and one with the afternoon half.] Do we say that as the *chavitin* is doubled, so the *levonah* is doubled, and

two fistfuls are brought in the morning and two in the afternoon, or (do we limit the doubling to the *chavitin*) do we bring only one fistful in the morning and one in the afternoon?

Rabbi Yosah said: Isn't the requirement to bring a fistful derived from the sinner's *minchah*? Just as there are only two fistfuls there, so too over here as well (and one fistful is brought in the morning and one in the afternoon).

Rabbi Chizkiyah responded: And isn't it true as well that the three *lugin* requirement is derived from the afternoon *tamid*, and (according to your reasoning) we can assert that just as there are only three *lugin* there, so too over here as well, and nevertheless – just as the inquiry exists over there, so too it exists here as well. (21a1 – 21a2)

The *Mishna* had stated: The Court also instituted that there is no *me'ilah* with respect of the ashes of the *parah adumah*.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachman said in the name of Rabbi Yonasan: One can derive from the *Mishna* that Biblically speaking, the laws of *me'ilah* should apply to ashes of the *parah adumah*, but the Sages decreed that it does not apply.

Saliva whose source isn't known

The *Gemora* challenges this, since the *braisa* learns this from the verse, which says regarding the heifer - *chatas hi* – it is a sin offering. The comparison to a *chatas* teaches that one is liable for *me'ilah* on the *parah adumah*, but the qualification of *hi* – it, teaches that one is not liable for *me'ilah* on the ashes.

Rabbi Avahu explains that although the verse excludes one from *me'ilah* on using the ashes, the Sages saw that people were lax and used the ashes to heal wounds, and they therefore decreed that one is liable for *me'ilah*. When people then were avoiding using the ashes to sprinkle in cases of doubtful impurity, the Sages revoked the initial decree, and reverted to the rule of the verse, that one is not liable for *me'ilah*. (21a2 – 21a3)

The *Gemora* asks: But how would this woman (who gave the money for a *chatas* bird) achieve atonement (when her money was used for an olah bird in a case where the money was found between the two boxes)?

Rabbi Yitzchak answered: It is a stipulation of the court (beforehand) that the one who supplies the nests (the birds for the *chatas* and olah offerings) provides replacements for the disqualified offerings. (21a3)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, MA'OS SHENIMTZA'U

All saliva found (*if saliva is found, and we do not know whose it is, though it might be that of a zav or a zavah, which by Biblical law is an av hatumah and contaminates human beings and vessels*) in Yerushalayim is *tahor*, except that of the upper marketplace (*which was frequented by the zavim, and avoided by others, in order not to contaminate other people*); these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosi has a different approach. He says that throughout the year, if one finds saliva in the middle of the street, it is *tamei*, and on the side of the road it is *tahor*, and the exact opposite during the time of Yom Tov. This is because during Yom Tov most people who walk in the middle of the street are assumed to be *tahor*. But during the rest of the year, we must be cautious that perhaps they are *tamei*.

A vessel whose source isn't known

There's another argument between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosi regarding *tumah*. If a vessel was found, and we are uncertain of its *taharah* status, then the halachah is as follows: if it's on the way down to a *mikvah*, it's assumed to still be *tamei* (since it hasn't yet been immersed.) But if it's on the way **up** from a *mikvah*, then we can assume that it was immersed, and hence it is *tahor*; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

Rabbi Yosi is more lenient, and says that all vessels (*keilim*) are considered *tahor*, except for a basket,

shovel and hammer, which are tools used for grave digging and bone transportation.

Finding knives before Pesach

If a knife was found on Erev Pesach (Nissan 14), we assume that it was used for slaughtering the Korban Pesach that day, and it is *tahor*. But if it was found a day earlier on the 13th of Nissan, the finder will have to immerse it again, in case the original owner did not immerse it yet.

If the knife that was found was a cleaver knife, then even on Erev Pesach it is assumed to be *tamei*. The reason is that since this type of a knife is used to crush bones – an action that cannot be done with a Korban Pesach – therefore we have to assume that it was meant for the following day's Korban Chagigah, and the knife is not yet *tahor*.

If the day of Erev Pesach or the first day of Pesach itself fell out on Erev Shabbos, both types of knives are *tahor*, since all know that one cannot immerse on Shabbos, and they took care of it ahead of time. Finally, if the cleaver is found attached to another knife, it takes on the status of the knife. So too if the knife is found attached to a cleaver, it takes on the cleaver's status. (21a4 – 21b1)

Is non-kosher blood tamei?

Rabbi Avin said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: There was a laundry operated by gentiles

there (in the upper marketplace; therefore, any spittle found there is deemed to be *tamei*).

The Gemora presents a multi-Amora discussion if the blood of a non kosher being – such as a mule or a *shoretz* (the examples given by the Gemora) – is *tamei* or not. Amongst the discussion were details about the amount of blood that's being discussed, and whether it just accepts *tumah* for itself, or does it transfer the *tumah* on.

The Gemora concludes that it is *tamei* indeed, since we follow Rabbi Yehuda's opinion, who was the halachic decider of the prince's household. (21b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Finding regular knives two days before Pesach, and finding cleaver knives even the day before Pesach, requires the finder to immerse them a second time (after the original owner immersed them.)

This “second” *tevila* is required even if one knows clearly that the original owner immersed it before, since it may have become *tamei* after the owner lost it.

Additionally, the Rambam explains that we consider this *tevila* as if it's on the seventh day of the *Parah Adumah* cycle. (The Torah says explicitly that the *Parah Adumah's* ashes are to be sprinkled on the person or vessel that's *tamei* on the third and seventh day.) Therefore, in order to fulfill the requirement of the *Parah Adumah* we take on that



today is the seventh day (second day of sprinkling), and we immerse the knife for the “second” time.

DAILY MASHAL

Replacing the Paroches

In the second Beis HaMikdash, two *parochos* (curtains) were hung to separate between the Kodosh and Kodosh Kadoshim (see Yoma 51b). In describing the *parochos*, the Mishna tells us that each one was a tefach thick, forty amos long, and twenty amos wide. The cost of each *paroches* amounted to eight hundred and twenty thousand dinar; or according to some versions of the Mishna eighty two women participated in weaving them (see Bartenura). The Mishna then adds that two new *parochos* were prepared each year.

The Tiferes Yisroel (Boaz, 3) asks why such an extravagant expense was necessary. We find in many places that the Torah encourages us to conserve our money. For this reason the *lechem hapanim* was not baked from the finest, most expensive flower. Similarly, the *ketores* was gathered in a silver shovel, rather than a golden one.

Why was it necessary to weave two such expensive *parochos* each year? The Tiferes Yisroel emphasizes his question by adding that the *parochos* were hung in the holiest of all places, which the kohanim preserved with meticulous cleanliness. Even when

the Kohen Gadol passed through the *parochos* on Yom Kippur, he did not touch them with his hands, but pulled them back by means of a golden hook.

In light of this perplexing question, the Tiferes Yisroel suggests a new explanation. The Mishna did not mean to say that new *parochos* were made each year and the old ones discarded. Rather, there were two sets of *parochos* used interchangeably each year. After each of the Shalosh Regalim, the vessels of the Beis HaMikdash were immersed in a mikva, in case a kohen ignorant of the laws of purity may have touched them. The *parochos* were also removed to be purified, and the second set was hung in their place.

The Maleches Shlomo, however, suggests that new *parochos* were indeed woven each year. *Ketores* was burned every day on the Gold Mizbei'ach in the Heichal, and the smoke that arose from it damaged the *parochos*.