

19 Nissan 5781
April 1, 2021



Shekalim Daf 11

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

[We learned in the Mishnah that, according to Abba Shaul, the Kohanim Gedolim would pay for the ramp of the red heifer from their own funds.] Rabbi Chanina said: There was great pomposity among the Kohanim Gedolim, as they would spend more than sixty talents of gold on constructing it. This expenditure was unnecessary, as the previous ramp of the heifer was still standing. But not one of the Kohanim Gedolim would take out his heifer on his predecessor’s ramp. Rather, he would demolish it and build a new one from his own funds. Rabbi Ulla raised an objection in the presence of Rabbi Mana: Wasn’t it taught in a *Baraisa* that Shimon HaTzaddik performed the service of two red heifers, and the ramp on which he took out this one he did not use again to take out that other one? Is it possible for you to say Shimon HaTzaddik was pompous? What, then, is the reason that he constructed a new ramp? It is due to a higher standard that was established with regard to the purity of the red heifer, and to show honor to the mitzvah of the parah adumah. It was taught in a *Baraisa*: Beams and walls would extend from the ramp from here and from there, i.e., on either side, in order that the Kohanim would not lean over the edge of the ramp and become tamei.¹ (11a1)

[We learned in the Mishnah that according to Rabbi Yishmael, the leftover remains of the chamber were used to purchase wine, oil, and fine flour. These items were sold to individuals who needed them for their private offerings, and the proceeds went to the Temple treasury.] Whereas Rabbi Akiva says: One may not generate profit [by selling

consecrated property or by using funds set aside for the poor. The Gemara explains that Rabbi Akiva prohibited doing business with consecrated funds only when there was a risk of loss.] However, if the seller of the wine, oil, or fine flour stipulated that any loss from the subsequent sale of these items would accrue to him, while any profit gained would go to the Temple treasury of consecrated property, it is permitted.²

An example like this³ can be found in a story involving Bar Zemina. Funds belonging to orphans were deposited with him. He came and asked Rabbi Mana if he was permitted to use this money for commerce. Rabbi Mana said to him: If you want to stipulate that any loss incurred will accrue to you and any profit will belong to both of you to share, then it is permitted. Rabbi Chiya bar Adda had funds belonging to orphans deposited with him and he did so.⁴ (11a1 – 11a2)

It was taught in the Mishnah that according to Rabbi Yishmael, the leftover fruits [was used to purchase the dessert of the altar, i.e., olah-offerings sacrificed at times when the altar was idle.] This leftover fruits discussed in the Mishnah is referring to the profits earned, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael cited earlier, as Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef explained the Mishnah as follows: The leftover fruits mentioned by Rabbi Yishmael is a reference to his earlier statement that the profits from the sales of wine, oil, and flour went to the Temple treasury of consecrated property. Regarding the term leftover libations mentioned by

¹ By leaning their bodies over a grave without any interposition.

² The potential profit or loss would result from fluctuations in the market price of these items.

³ Regarding funds collected for the poor.

⁴ He accepted all losses and split the profits with the orphans.

Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Chananyah, the deputy Kohen Gadol, this is referring to the fourth *se'ah*.⁵ Rabbi Yoḥanan explained the Mishnah as follows: The leftover fruits, this is referring to the fourth *se'ah*. The leftover libations, this is referring to the overbrim of the substance when measured.⁶ The Gemara asks: And is Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef not of the opinion that the Temple profits from the overbrim?⁷ Rabbi Chizkiyah said: That which befalls the fourth *se'ah* befalls the overbrim as well.⁸ All is in order according to the opinion of Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef (who maintains that the leftover fruits was sold for profit by the Temple treasury): One may not generate profit by selling consecrated property, and not even with funds set aside for the poor, and therefore it is understandable why the Mishnah concludes: Neither this one nor this one (Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Chananyah), agreed with Rabbi Yishmael's opinion with regard to the leftover fruits. However, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who maintains that the 'leftover fruits' is referring to the profit gained from the fourth *se'ah*, it is difficult. Didn't we learn in a Mishnah that (if the treasurer paid for a product at the price of four units per *sela*, and at the time it was delivered the price had risen and) stood at three units per *sela*, the seller must still provide the fruits at the original price of four units per *sela* (leaving the Temple treasury with an extra unit from which to profit)?⁹ However, we learned in the Mishnah that neither this one nor this one (Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Chananyah), agreed with Rabbi Yishmael's opinion with regard to the leftover fruits. The Gemara answers: [Everyone agrees that the fourth *se'ah* may be sold on behalf of the Temple treasury. When the Mishnah says that Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Chananyah did not agree with regard to the

⁵ If the treasurer of the Temple paid in advance for a year's worth of wine, oil, and flour, and the price of these goods later rose, the seller was required to provide the goods at the original, lower price. The treasury then sold these items at the higher price to individuals who needed them for offerings. For example, if the treasurer paid for flour at the price of four *se'ah* for one *sela*, and the price then rose to three *se'ah* for one *sela*, the seller would have to provide four *se'ah* for one *sela*. This fourth *se'ah* was sold, and the profit from this sale was given to the Temple.

⁶ When one sells a certain measure of wine, oil, or flour to the Temple treasury, he is required to fill the measuring vessel above the rim, so that he provides more than the exact measurement. However, when the Temple treasurer sells these products, he must be exact in the

leftover fruits, it means that] they did not agree that the profits from the fruits should be used for purchasing the dessert of the altar. However, they did agree that they may be used for purchasing sacred vessels. (11a2 – 11a3)

[It appears that all agree that profits from the overbrim of the measures are used to purchase sacred vessels.] The Gemara asks: Until here, it is reasonable to say that the overbrim from communal offerings is used to purchase sacred vessels. However, is it possible to say that the sacred vessels could be purchased even with the overbrim of private offerings? Wouldn't it emerge that the sacred vessels had come from a private offering, which is not permitted? The Gemara answers that it is like that which we learned in a *Baraisa*: In the case of a woman who made a tunic, one of the priestly vestments, for her son (a Kohen Gadol) to wear while he serves in the Temple, the tunic is valid. [However, since the priestly vestments must come from communal funds, the Kohen may only use his mother's tunic in the Temple] provided that she completely transfers ownership of the tunic to the public ownership.¹⁰

Until now, the discussion has concerned liquid overbrim, e.g., wine or oil.¹¹ Is the same true even for dry overbrim, such as fine flour, in which the overbrim was piled on top of the already full vessel?¹² The Gemara answers: The *halachah* is in accordance with that which we learned in a Mishnah there: In the case of the libations, which include fine flour, that were sanctified in a sacred vessel and, subsequently, the offering they were meant to accompany is found to be disqualified, if there is another offering there that requires

measurements. The difference between these two amounts is referred to in the Mishnah as the leftover libations.

⁷ Why, then, does he omit any reference to it in his explanation of the Mishnah?

⁸ Both fall under the same category of leftover libations.

⁹ Apparently, all agree that the treasury may profit in this manner.

¹⁰ Similarly, if the owner donates the overbrim to the public, it is permissible to use the profit to purchase sacred vessels.

¹¹ Since the overbrim was originally within the confines of the sacred vessel, it attained consecrated status.

¹² If the overbrim was never actually within the confines of the vessel, is it consecrated?

libations, they may be sacrificed with it. And if not, and they are left overnight, they become disqualified by being left overnight.¹³ (11a3 – 11a4)

Halachah 3 · MISHNAH: The *Mishnah* states: The remainder of the incense - what was done with it (*in order to make it usable for the next year*)? The wages of the workmen (*who prepared the incense*) were allocated (*from the half-shekels in the Temple treasury; and the money was deconsecrated when it was given to them*), and the extra incense was deconsecrated by exchanging it for the worker's money, and (*the extra incense was*) given to the workmen as their wages, and was then re-purchased (*from them*) with the new donations (*and now could be used for the next year*). If the *shekalim* were brought in the proper time, they were re-purchased with the new donations; otherwise, they were re-purchased from the old donations. (11a4 – 11a5)

The *Gemora* asks: But this presents a problem, since the workers' production of the Ketores was also considered to be consecrated, so how can consecrated objects be transferred upon another consecrated object?

How does he do this? Rabbi Shimon bar Bisna explains that Temple buildings are built first with non-sacred materials and then they are consecrated. [*They pay on credit instead of with money. If they would use money, the money becomes deconsecrated and the materials consecrated.*] This is because he who donates money to the Temple consecrates it (*and therefore the money cannot be used to pay the workers*), and therefore, the treasurer says, "The sacredness of the money shall be deconsecrated to the building," so that the money (*which is now nonsacred*) may be used to pay the workers as their wages. [*When the building is finished it was exchanged against the money donated to the Temple for this building. The money becomes again non-sacred and can be used to satisfy the sellers and the workers.*] (11a5 – 11b1)

¹³ Since the Mishnah does not distinguish between liquid libations and fine flour, the Gemara understands that no distinction should be drawn with regard to the overbrim; even dry overbrim is consecrated and can be used for the purchase of sacred vessels.

The *Gemora* asks: What was done with the money that was used to deconsecrate the ketores? Rebbe said: I said that it is given to the houses of Garmu and Avtinah, for they were experts in the compounding of the ketores and the preparation of the showbread. Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak notes: This can only work however, if Hekdesh owed the workers money from last year, but the redemption of the leftover Ketores could not be used to pay this year's salaries. Rabbi Chiya bar Ba asked: If the Temple treasury did not owe these artisans money from work done previously, what would be done with the money? Rabbi Ba came and said in the name of Rabbi Chiya, who said in the name of Rabbi Yosi: The treasury uses the money to buy offerings as dessert for the Altar.¹⁴ Rabbi Ba bar Kohen asked in the presence of Rabbi Yosi: Is the opinion of Rabbi Chiya bar Ba reversed? There, at first, he needed clarification with regard to this question, and here it is obvious to him that one may use the money to pay for the dessert of the Altar.¹⁵ The Gemara explains: That about which he needed clarification is whether the money used to deconsecrate the incense may be used to purchase sacred vessels. That which was obvious to him is that the money may be used to buy offerings for the dessert of the Altar.

For they disagreed as follows: In the case where the Ketores was compounded in *chulin* vessels, Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chaninah says that it is invalid. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi disagrees and says that the Ketores is valid. What is the reason of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chaninah? The verse says "Kodesh hee" (It is kodesh), i.e., all its aspects should be consecrated. What is the reason of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi? The verse says "Kodesh hee" (It is kodesh), i.e., and it is only teaching us that the funds should come out of the shekel donations.¹⁶

¹⁴ *Keitz mizbe'ach* – offering additional korbanos on the mizbe'ach so it should not sit idle.

¹⁵ The answer to the question was given by Rabbi Ba in the name of Rabbi Chiya, and that same Rabbi Chiya asked the question.

¹⁶ But there's no obligation to prepare it in consecrated vessels.

Rabbi Yosi, son of Rabbi Bun, said: The opinion of Rabbi Yosi ben Chaninah goes in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel. and the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yochanan. As we learned in a Mishnah: If one consecrates all of his possessions, and among them there are items that are suitable for use as communal offerings. Rabbi Yochanan said: The Mishnah refers to incense.¹⁷ Rabbi Hoshayah said: The Mishnah refers to an artisan of the house of Avtinas, who would receive incense as his wages.¹⁸ And the opinion of Rabbi Yosi ben Chaninah is in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel, as Rav Huna said in the name of Shmuel: With regard to the mortar (within which they grounded the incense), the Sages considered it like a sacred vessel with regard to its ability to bestow an elevated, consecrated status upon its contents.¹⁹

Rabbi Yosi, son of Rabbi Bun, said: Rabbi Chuna said this *halachah* of Shmuel before Rabbi Yosi and asked: May an item that was sanctified in a sacred vessel be redeemed?²⁰ Rabbi Yosi said to him: Isn't that precisely the opinion of Shmuel? As Shmuel said: This is a leniency with regard to leftover communal offerings, including incense. The Gemara cites the source of Shmuel's opinion: For there was a

¹⁷ Apparently, he maintained that it is possible for one to be in possession of incense that has not yet been consecrated. Therefore, he must also maintain that incense that was prepared in a non-sacred vessel is valid for use, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi.

¹⁸ The incense was prepared in a sacred vessel, but it could come into his possession after being deconsecrated.

¹⁹ Apparently, Shmuel holds that the incense must be prepared in a sacred vessel.

²⁰ Since placing an item in a sacred vessel elevates its sanctity, ordinarily it would not be possible to transfer its sanctity onto money. Yet Shmuel insists that the incense be prepared in a sacred vessel, and the leftover incense was deconsecrated by transferring its sanctity onto money.

²¹ They may not be sacrificed in the coming year, as they were not purchased with funds collected for that year.

²² Although in general one may redeem such animals only after they develop a blemish. Shmuel said: The daily offerings (*those purchased with the half-shekel contributions from this year*) which were not necessary for the community (*for extra lambs were bought just in case the others had a blemish*) are redeemed even if they are unblemished. *They could not be used for the following year; accordingly, they could be redeemed in order to make them usable. They were redeemed with*

disagreement with regard to unblemished lambs that had been set aside for the daily offerings and remained unused at the end of the year.²¹ Shmuel said: They may be redeemed even as unblemished animals.²² Rabbi Yochanan said: Although they are animals remaining from the previous year, they still must be redeemed in the regular manner, like any other consecrated animals that have been disqualified.²³

If he-goats that were set aside for communal chatas-offerings were left over at the end of the year, according to Shmuel they may be redeemed in their unblemished state. If an olah-offering may be redeemed unblemished, all the more so it should be permitted to redeem an animal set aside as a chatas-offering.²⁴ Rabbi Ze'ira said in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan's opinion: They should be left to graze (until they develop a blemish); only then may they be redeemed.²⁵ Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak said: They are themselves used as olah-offerings as dessert for the Altar without being redeemed. The Gemara asks: But this is difficult: Is there a chatas-offering that may be brought as an olah-offering? Rabbi Yosi said: This case is different, as it is dealing with a communal offering; communal offerings are designated as a particular type of offering only with their slaughter, and not when they are consecrated in the first place. Rabbi Chiya

unconsecrated money and the money is added to the Temple treasury collection, and used to plate the Holy of Holies. These lambs would then be purchased with the new half-shekel contributions, and used as offerings for the next year. The same holds true for remaining incense; it too may be deconsecrated in a more lenient manner.

²³ One must wait until they develop a blemish; only at that point may they be redeemed.

²⁴ With regard to an animal set aside for a olah-offering, if it was not redeemed in its unblemished state, but became blemished and was subsequently redeemed, the funds used for its redemption would go to purchase another burnt-offering for the repletion of the altar. The value set aside as olah-offering thus would remain dedicated to that purpose. In the parallel case of a chatas-offering, the funds used to redeem a blemished leftover communal chatas-offering did not go to the purchase of a new chatas-offering but to the purchase of an olah-offering for the dessert of the altar as well. Since the animal's sanctification as a chatas-offering is effectively nullified in any case, it is easier in such a case to be lenient and permit the redemption of the animal even before it has become blemished.

²⁵ The funds used to redeem the animals became sanctified and were allocated for the purchase of olah-offerings for the dessert of the Altar.



offers a different explanation and says: It is a condition of the court, which stipulates with regard to remaining animals that even if they have been set aside as communal chatas-offerings they may be sacrificed as olah-offerings. (11b1 – 11b5)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

How did Betzalel fruits the Ketores without a Mishkan?

The Meshech Chochma is *mechadesh* a new argument between Rashi and the Rambam. The Rambam rules like Rabbi Yossi Bar Chanina who holds that any Ketores that's produced outside the Beis Hamikdash or in *chulin* vessels is not valid. If so, asks the Meshech Chochma, how did Betzalel fruits the Ketores before the Mishkan was built? (In Shmos 38:29 it says that Betzalel made the Ketores, and only later in Shmos 40:33 did Moshe put the Mishkan together.)

He answers that the Rambam is understanding the pesukim like the Ramban, who learns that that particular production of the Ketores was done during the week preceding the inauguration of the Mishkan (the period of seven days known as the "Miluim"), and therefore didn't conform to the regular halachos.

However, Rashi in passuk 40:27 clearly writes that this Ketores is the daily Ketores, and if so, the question remains: how was it produced without the Mishkan?

It must be, ascertains the Meshech Chochma, that Rashi rules like Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi of our argument, and when one produces the Ketores with *chulin* vessels, it is nevertheless valid.

DAILY MASHAL

Rebbe said: I said that it is given to the houses of Garmu and Avtinas, for they were experts in the compounding of the ketores and the preparation of the showbread.

Many times in Shas, it is found that Rebbe used this terminology, "I say etc." What was his intention with these words?

Reb Yosef Engel in Beis Haotzar explains that it is known that Rebbe was a tremendously humble person. The Gemora in Sotah (49a) states that when Rebbe died, humility ceased. Perhaps what Rebbe was saying was that it appears to him that the halachah is like this-and-this, but not that it is most definitely so.

He also writes that it is clear from the seforim of the students of the Baal Shem Tov that lofty people are constantly thinking that their words and actions are not emanating from their own power and strength; rather, it is all coming from the Ribbono shel Olam. In kabbalah, the Shechinah is referred to as "Ani," "I." This is the explanation in the Gemora Sukkah (53a) when Hillel said, "If I am here, then everyone is here." The "I" did not refer to himself, for Hillel, we also know was extremely humble. Rather, he was referring to the Shechinah. This, perhaps, is what Rebbe was saying when he said, "I say." The Shechinah which is inside of me is saying that the halachah is like this.