

14 Nissan 5781
March 27, 2021



Shekalim Daf 6

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

MISHNAH: HALACHAH 3 - If a person gathers small coins one by one, and proclaims, “these will go towards my shekel,” Beis Hillel and Beis Shammai are in a disagreement about what to do with any money above the shekel amount, where Beis Shammai holds that the excess money should go towards a *nedavah* – voluntary communal offerings, while Beis Hillel maintains that this extra money is *chullin* (non-consecrated).¹ However, if the person proclaims, “I will bring my shekel from them”, then all agree that the remainder is *chullin*.

If a person gathers small coins one by one, and proclaims, “these will go towards my *chatas*,” they (even Beis Hillel) agrees that the remainder is considered a *nedavah*. if the person proclaims, “I will bring my *chatas* from them,” then all agree that the remainder is *chullin*. Rabbi Shimon says: What is the difference between *shekalim* and *chatas*? *Shekalim* are always a fixed amount (therefore it is logical that the remainder will be *chullin*), contrasted with the *chatas* that has no fixed amount.² Rabbi Yehudah says that even *Shekalim* have no limits, For when the Jewish people ascended from the exile, they would use *darkonos*³ as their

currency (and would thus contribute *darkonos* as their shekel; they brought these coins with them and would give a half of one to fulfill their half-shekel obligation; this was equivalent to one shekel⁴). Later on, they switched to using *selaim* as their unit of currency,⁵ and even later they switched to using *tevain*⁶ as their unit of currency. People wished to contribute *dinars* (a half-*teva*) for their shekel requirement.⁷ The Sages refused to accept it from them.⁸ Rabbi Shimon said (in response): Even so,⁹ everyone¹⁰ contributes the same amount.¹¹ However, a *chatas*-offering has no fixed amount whatsoever; this person may bring an animal worth a *sela*, and that one may bring one worth two, and this one may bring one worth three.¹² (6a1 – 6a2)

GEMARA: It is taught in the Mishnah: If a person gathers [small coins one by one, and proclaims, “these will go towards my shekel,” Beis Shammai holds that the excess money should go towards a *nedavah* – voluntary communal offerings, while Beis Hillel maintains that this extra money is *chullin*.] Rabbi Yosi said in the name of Rabbi Lazar: With regard to what do they disagree? With regard to one who gathers coin by coin [piecemeal].¹³ However, with regard to

¹ Beis Hillel is of the opinion that a consecration made in error is not valid.

² So the entire sum that he has amassed will be a *nedavah*.

³ Which were coins used in the Persian Empire.

⁴ A *darkon* was worth two *selas* by Torah law, so they gave half a *darkon* as their obligation.

⁵ And when they contributed for their obligation, they gave a half-*sela*, which is one shekel.

⁶ A *teva* coin was worth one shekel, or half a *sela*.

⁷ When the value of this currency changed later on, they wished to contribute with a *teva*, a different coin which is worth a half-shekel. Some people wished to contribute only *dinars*, which are half the value of the *teva*, i.e., one quarter shekel in value.

⁸ They required them to contribute at least the half-shekel mentioned in the Torah. Nevertheless, it is clear that the obligation of contributing shekels does not have a fixed value.

⁹ Despite the fact that during different periods there were different amounts used to fulfill the obligation of the half-shekel.

¹⁰ At any particular time.

¹¹ Therefore, any sum collected in excess of that amount was not intended to be consecrated.

¹² Therefore, it cannot be supposed that there was no intention to consecrate the whole sum.

¹³ Adding small coins bit by bit until they amount to a large sum. It is assumed that he intended to contribute only a half-shekel but did not pay attention to the fact that a larger sum had accumulated. According to Beis Hillel, an item that was consecrated by mistake does not become consecrated, and thus the leftover money is non-sacred property.

one who [grabs a handful of coins and] says, “These are for my shekel,” everyone agrees¹⁴ that the leftover coins are designated for voluntary (communal) offerings.

The Gemara cites an alternate version: Rabbi Chiya and Rabbi Bivi said in the name of Rabbi Lazar: With regard to what do they disagree? With regard to one who gathers coin by coin [piecemeal]. However, with regard to one who [grabs a handful of coins and] says, “These are for my shekel,” everyone agrees that the leftover coins are *chullin* (non-sacred property).¹⁵

Rabbi Chiya said: The Mishnah supports the opinion of Rabbi Bivi,¹⁶ as we learned in the Mishnah: Rabbi Shimon said: What is the difference between *shekalim* and *chatas*? *Shekalim* are always a fixed amount (therefore it is logical that the remainder will be *chullin*), contrasted with the *chatas* that has no fixed amount. The Gemara asks: What case are we addressing? If it is a case where one collects money in small amounts and says, “I will bring my shekel from these coins,” everyone agrees that the leftover coins are *chullin*. And likewise if he says, “I will bring my chatas-offering from these coins,” here too, everyone agrees that the leftover money is *chullin*. Rather, this is the case we are addressing: when one grabs a handful of coins and says, “These are for my shekel.” [Rabbi Shimon holds that] regarding *shekalim*, since their fixed value is explicitly from the Torah, the leftover coins are *chullin*.¹⁷ However, with regard to a chatas-offering, since it has no fixed value from

the Torah,¹⁸ the leftover money is used for voluntary (communal) offerings.¹⁹ The Gemara asks: What does Rabbi Yosi, in the name of Rabbi Eliezer, do with this proof? The Gemara answers: He interprets it as referring to one who collects coin by coin, and it is in accordance only with the opinion of Beis Hillel.²⁰ The Gemara challenges Rabbi Yosi: Didn’t we learn in the (next) Mishnah: The leftover *shekalim* are *chullin*?²¹ The Gemara answers: There is no such implication. Rabbi Yosi interprets the Mishnah as limited to the case of one who collects coin by coin, and it is in accordance with the opinion of Beis Hillel.²² (6a2 – 6a3)

The Gemara discusses a different case: When a person sets aside his shekel and thought at that point that he is obligated to contribute it, and it emerges that he is not obligated to contribute it,²³ the shekel that he separated is not consecrated.²⁴ With regard to one who sets aside two *shekalim* simultaneously and thought that he is obligated to contribute two,²⁵ and it emerges that he is obligated to contribute only one,²⁶ what do you do with the second one that was mistakenly set aside? Let us hear the *halachah* from this *Baraisa*: If one set aside his chatas-offering, and at that point he thought that he was liable,²⁷ and it emerges that he was not liable, the animal is not consecrated. If one set aside two animals and thought at the time that he had unwittingly transgressed two prohibitions and was therefore liable to sacrifice two chatas-offerings, and it emerges that he was liable to sacrifice only one, what do you do with that second

¹⁴ He must have intended to consecrate the entire sum.

¹⁵ Since it is forbidden to add to the prescribed amount, even Beis Shammai agree that he did not intend to consecrate a sum of money so beyond the requirement of the half-shekel.

¹⁶ That everyone agrees that the leftover coins are *chullin*.

¹⁷ Because even when he held all the money he intended only to take the value of a half-shekel from it.

¹⁸ As each person brings an animal of whatever value he wants; it is possible that one intended to bring an animal worth the entire value of the coins he took.

¹⁹ This is a proof for Rabbi Beivai’s opinion that when one grabs a handful of coins and says, “These are for my shekel,” everyone agrees that the leftover money is *chullin*.

²⁰ Rabbi Shimon is not discussing a case where he grasped a handful of coins, but rather, he refers to a case where one was collecting coin by coin, and he was explaining why Beis Hillel holds regarding Shekalim that the

leftover is *chullin*, but by a chatas, he agrees to Beis Shammai that the leftover is for a nedavah.

²¹ This implies that in all situations where one consecrates *shekalim*, including those where one grasped a handful of coins and said, “These are for my shekel,” the leftovers are *chullin*, even according to Beis Shammai, as the Mishnah was taught anonymously, which is in accordance with Rabbi Bivi’s explanation.

²² In such a case, the leftover money is *chullin*.

²³ E.g., he realized now that he had contributed already.

²⁴ Just as other mistakenly consecrated items do not become consecrated according to Beis Hillel.

²⁵ One for the current year and one for the previous year.

²⁶ As he realized now that he had in fact contributed the previous year’s shekel.

²⁷ As he had unwittingly sinned in such a manner requiring him to bring a chatas-offering.

animal? It must rather be left to graze.²⁸ So too, these mistakenly set aside half-*shekalim*,²⁹ are designated for voluntary offerings. The Gemara rejects this comparison between the case of the extra shekel and the case of the extra chatas-offerings. Here (in the case of extra *shekalim*), how can you say that these are designated for voluntary offerings?³⁰ (6a3 – 6a4)

The Mishnah stated: Rabbi Yuda says etc. [The Gemara first explains the Mishnah's terminology.] Darkonos are golden dinars. The phrase: They switched to using *sela*im as their unit of currency, is as it sounds; i.e., *sela* coins. The phrase: They switched to using *tevain* as their unit of currency, refers to a half-*sela* coin, the equivalent of two silver dinar. The phrase: They wished to contribute dinars (a half-*teva*) for their shekel requirement, [*dinars*] are *keratin*, (i.e., a quarter of a *sela*, or one dinar). (6a4)

The Mishnah continues: They refused to accept it from them. [The Sages did not agree to accept dinars in place of the half-shekel. From where did the Sages derive this?] From this verse: We made commandments for us, to give ourselves yearly with the third part of the basic unit of currency for the service of the House of our God.³¹

[Once this verse is mentioned, the Gemara discusses other *halakhos* that are derived from it.] Rabbi Chilkiyah said in the name of Rabbi Acha:³² From here one may derive that a person must donate his shekel three times a year (meaning that he must give a shekel to charity three times a year). One

²⁸ On the one hand, it is consecrated with the sanctity of a chatas-offering, but on the other hand, since the person who consecrated it is not obligated in another chatas-offering, it cannot be sacrificed. Therefore, it must be left to graze until it develops a blemish and is disqualified from being offered. It can then be sold, with the proceeds used to purchase voluntary offerings.

²⁹ I.e., in the case of one who set aside two half-*shekalim* and in the end was obligated only to contribute one.

³⁰ The Mishnah clearly distinguishes between the leftover money when collecting *shekalim*, which is considered *chullin*, and the leftover money when collecting for a chatas-offering, which is considered consecrated for voluntary offerings.

³¹ The third of a shekel cited in this verse is one-third of a darkon, the prevalent coin of the time. Until that time, the custom was to contribute a half of the prevalent coin of the time. The Sages of that generation were concerned that over time the value of the prevalent coin would be reduced

may also derive from here that one may not burden the community by asking them for charity more than three times a year.

Rabbi Avin said: From here, there is also support for the fact that the baskets into which the collection of the chamber was collected were three *se'ah* in size; and from here, there is a hint to the three collection baskets and the three collections of the chamber during the year. (6a4)

It is written: This they shall give, everyone who passes through the census, etc. Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Nechemyah disagree with regard to the reason for the mitzvah. One said: Because they sinned (with the Golden Calf) at half of the day, they should give a half-shekel. And one said: Because they sinned at the sixth hour of the day, they should give a half-shekel, whose sum is equal to six *garmisin*.³³ Rabbi Yehoshua of the house of Rabbi Nechemyah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai: Because the Jewish people transgressed the Ten Commandments (at the time of the Golden Calf),³⁴ each one of them shall give ten *geirah*, which equals a half-shekel.³⁵ Rabbi Berechyah and Rabbi Levi said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: Since they sold the firstborn of Rachel³⁶ for twenty pieces of silver, the nation was commanded that each of them must redeem his firstborn son with twenty pieces of silver.³⁷ (6a4 – 6a5)

Rabbi Pinchas said in the name of Rabbi Levi: Since ten of Yaakov's sons sold Rachel's firstborn for twenty pieces of

to the extent that people would no longer be contributing the value of the half-shekel of the Torah. The verse reports that they therefore set a minimum for the collection, which is the precedent for the Sages of the Mishnah not accepting the request to lower the fixed amount to a dinar.

³² This verse is about with the mitzvah of charity. The term *shelishis*, one-third, used in this verse contains superfluous letters, as it could have been written *shelish* and maintained its meaning.

³³ A small coin that was prevalent in that period.

³⁴ Since the Jewish people violated the first commandment, it was as if they transgressed all ten, as one who admits to the truth of idolatry is as if he has denied the entire Torah.

³⁵ As a whole shekel consists of twenty *geirah*.

³⁶ The sons of Yaakov sold Yosef.

³⁷ Which is five *sela*, as there are four dinar in a *sela*.

silver, each of them received a *taba'ah* (i.e., two dinars); therefore, each and every man must give a *taba'ah* for his shekel obligation every year. (6a5)

Halachah 4 · MISHNAH: The leftover money from what was set aside for *shekalim* is *chullin*.³⁸ However, with regard to the leftover money from what one set aside to purchase the tenth of an *ephah* (of fine flour for a minchah-offering) and the leftover money from what one set aside to purchase the pairs of birds of a *zav*, the pairs of birds of a *zavah*, and the pairs of birds of a woman after childbirth, chatas-offerings, or ashram-offerings, in these cases, its leftover money must be used for voluntary (communal) offerings.³⁹ This is the general rule: Whatever money is designated for a chatas-offering or for an ashram-offering, its leftover money must be used for voluntary offerings. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase an olah-offering that he owes,⁴⁰ must be used for another olah-offering that he will bring in the future. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase fine flour for a minchah-offering must be used for another minchah-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a shelamim-offering must be used for another shelamim-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a lamb for his pesach-offering is used for purchasing a shelamim-offering.⁴¹ The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase sacrifices for a number of [poor] nezirim must be used to purchase sacrifices for other nezirim. The leftover money from what a single nazir set aside for his own offering must be used for voluntary (communal) offerings. (6b1)

Rabbi Yosi said: While I was still there (in Babylonia), I heard the voice of Rav Yehudah ask his teacher Shmuel: If one set aside his shekel and died before he contributed it to the Temple treasurer, what is to be done with this money?

³⁸ In accordance with the opinion of Beis Hillel in the previous Mishnah.

³⁹ That are offered as repletion of the altar, i.e., olah-offerings sacrificed at times when the altar was idle.

⁴⁰ Due to a vow or to volunteering.

⁴¹ It is not used for another pesach-offering, such as for the following year.

⁴² The Mishnah stated explicitly that the leftover money from the tenth of an ephah is used for voluntary offerings and not cast into the Dead Sea, as Rabbi Yochanan requires.

Shmuel said to him: It must be allocated for voluntary (communal) offerings. (6b1 – 6b2)

If a Kohen Gadol set aside money to purchase fine flour for his minchah-offering and then discovered that he had separated more than was necessary, what should be done with the leftover money from his tenth of an ephah? Rabbi Yochanan said that he must cast it into the Dead Sea and dispose of it there. Rabbi Lazar said it must be allocated for voluntary (communal) offerings. The Gemara notes: The Mishnah disagrees with Rabbi Yochanan, as it is taught: The leftover money from the shekel is *chullin*. However, with regard to the leftover money from the tenth of an ephah, the leftover money from the pairs of birds of a *zav* and from the pairs of birds of a *zavah*, the leftover money from the pairs of birds of a woman after childbirth, from chatas-offerings and ashram-offerings, all of this leftover money must be used for voluntary (communal) offerings.⁴² The Gemara asks: What does Rabbi Yochanan do with the Mishnah? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yochanan explains that the Mishnah is not referring to the leftover money of a Kohen Gadol's minchah-offering. Rather, it is referring to the leftover money of the tenth of an ephah of the minchah-offering of a sinner among the entire Jewish people.⁴³ (6b2)

Rabbi Yosi said: On this point Abba bar Ba raised a difficulty. As they, the Sages of Babylonia, said: From where is it derived that an animal that was designated for use as the pesach-offering (and was ultimately slaughtered not in its proper time for the sake of a shelamim-offering)⁴⁴ is transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering? The verse states: If his offering for the sacrifice of the shelamim-offering is from the flock. This verse indicates that any offering that comes from the flock, i.e., sheep or goats, may come as a shelamim-offering.⁴⁵

⁴³ Everyone agrees that the leftover money of this type of minchah-offering must be used for voluntary offerings; however, the leftover money of a Kohen Gadol's minchah-offering is cast into the Dead Sea.

⁴⁴ The proper time for the pesach-offering is on the fourteenth of Nissan from noon until sundown. If it is slaughtered before or after this time for the sake of a shelamim, it is valid.

⁴⁵ The verse is referring to a pesach-offering, about which it is written: "You shall take it from the sheep or from the goats", and it must refer to one that

Rabbi Abba bar Ba raised an objection with regard to this source: An olah-offering also comes from the flock, and yet its leftover money is not used for a shelamim-offering; it is used for an olah-offering. The Gemara answers: The verse is referring to items that may come only from the flock; this excludes olah-offerings, which may come even from cattle.

Rabbi Abba bar Ba raised another objection: An asham-offering comes only from the flock, and the Mishnah taught that its leftover money is used for voluntary offerings.⁴⁶ Rabbi Bun bar Kahana said that the phrase “From the flock” indicates that which comes from all kinds in the flock, i.e., sheep and goats. This excludes an asham-offering, which may come from only sheep.

The Gemara challenges Rabbi Bun: In every other place you say that the word “from” comes to exclude items from a particular category, and here you say that the word “from” comes to include (the pesach-offering, as “from” indicates all kinds of animals that can be considered part of a flock). The Gemara answers: Rabbi Mana said: In this verse too, “from” comes to exclude. One exclusion is that the pesach-offering may not come from an animal that is in its second year. There is an additional exclusion that a pesach-offering may not come from a female animal.⁴⁷ Rabbi Mana adds: And [if not for the extra “hey”] Rabbi Bun bar Kahana would interpret the verse “If his offering is from the flock” with regard to an asham-offering (and not to a pesach-offering), the word “from” would also come to exclude. It would teach that asham-offerings may come only from sheep and not from goats.

Rabbi Abba bar Ba raised another objection on the source of the Babylonian Sages. Isn’t it written: If his offering is from the flock, whether from the sheep or from the goats for an

was offered not during its proper time; however, if it were offered on Erev Pesach as a shelamim-offering it would clearly be invalid.

⁴⁶ However, according to this explanation, it too should be able to be sacrificed as a shelamim-offering.

⁴⁷ And it is the extra letter “hey” (not the word “from”) which implies both sheep and goats.

olah-offering? [According to your opinion, this verse could just as easily be interpreted to indicate that in the case of any offering that comes from sheep or from goats, the leftover money must be used for an olah-offering.] Now, if so, the leftover money of the pesach-offering (which may come from sheep or from goats), must then come as an olah-offering (and not as a shelamim-offering). The Gemara answers: Rabbi Avun said: An item that is designated for eating, e.g., the pesach-offering, which is eaten by its owners, may be transformed into another item that is designated for eating, e.g., a shelamim-offering. However, an item that is designated for eating, like the pesach-offering, may not be transformed into another item that is not designated for eating, such as the olah-offering, which is completely consumed on the altar. Rabbi Yosi bar Rabbi Bun said another answer: The status of offerings of kodashim kalim may be transformed and designated as other sacrifices of kodashim kalim. Therefore, the pesach-offering, which is of kodashim kalim, can be transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering, which is also of kodashim kalim. However, the status of offerings of kodashim kalim may not be transformed and designated as offerings of kodshei kodashim, such as an olah-offering.

Rabbi Yochanan said: On this point, Rabbi Chanina raised an issue that they, the Sages of Babylonia, said that the status of a pesach-offering that is not offered at the proper time is not transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering, unless it was slaughtered as a shelamim-offering.⁴⁸ However, I say that even if he slaughtered it as an olah-offering, it may be transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering. Rabbi Ila said: The reason, i.e., the source, for the opinion of Rabbi Chanina quoted by Rabbi Yochanan is the redundancy in the verse, as it is written: If his offering for the sacrifice of the shelamim-offering is from the flock.⁴⁹ The extra phrase “for the sacrifice” indicates that a pesach-offering

⁴⁸ But if it was slaughtered for another offering, such as an olah offering, it is disqualified.

⁴⁹ It could have simply written: If his offering of the shelamim-offering is from the flock.

slaughtered as any kind of offering, including an olah-offering, it comes to be a shelamim-offering.

The Gemara asks: According to this opinion of Rabbi Yochanan, may a pesach-offering that was sacrificed as an olah-offering be transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering even it was slaughtered with a disqualifying intention? If, during one of the services involved in an offering's sacrifice, i.e., slaughter, receiving the blood, bringing it to the altar, or sprinkling it on the altar, the Kohen or the one bringing the offering entertains the thought of performing any of the other services or eating the offering at a time that is unfit, the offering is thereby invalidated [*piggul*]. The Gemara asks: How was it done? If one slaughtered the pesach-offering as an olah-offering in order to sprinkle the blood the following day, in any case, whether it is transformed and designated as an olah-offering or as a shelamim-offering it is disqualified.⁵⁰ The Gemara answers:⁵¹ If you say that even if one offers the pesach-offering with a disqualifying intention, such as to sprinkle the blood the following day, it is transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering, and if not for the disqualifying intention it would be a valid offering, it is deemed *piggul* and one who eats the meat is liable to receive *karet*. However, if you say that when the pesach-offering is offered with a disqualifying intention, it is not transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering, since it remains a pesach-offering and it was sacrificed at the wrong time, then it is simply a disqualified offering, but not one that is *piggul*. In that case, one who eats the meat is not liable to receive *karet*. This question remains unresolved. (6b2 – 6b5)

⁵⁰ The intention to sprinkle the blood at an improper time disqualifies the offering, so it does not matter whether it is transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering or not.

⁵¹ The issue is whether one who eats an olive-bulk from the meat of this offering is liable to receive *karet*, like one who eats *piggul* meat, or whether he is not liable, like one who eats a regular disqualified offering. The principle is that an offering becomes *piggul* only when one slaughters an otherwise valid offering with an intention that disqualifies it. However, when the offering is disqualified for some other reason, the improper intention does not render the offering *piggul*.

[If one slaughters the pesach-offering on Erev Pesach as a shelamim-offering, before the proper time for the pesach-offering, it is transformed and designated as a shelamim-offering, and it is valid. However, if one slaughters it as a pesach-offering, then it is disqualified, since it is not the proper time.] The Gemara asks: What is the *halachah* if one slaughters it for itself and not for itself, meaning that at the beginning of the act of slaughtering one intends to slaughter it as a pesach-offering, but at its conclusion he does so as a shelamim-offering, and it is not on Erev Pesach but during the rest of the days of the year? Rabbi Bun bar Chiya said in the name of Shmuel bar Abba: Once he has said (at the conclusion that he is slaughtering it) not for its own sake, it is regarded as if he slaughtered it in silence not for its own sake, and therefore, it is valid.⁵² One of the disciples said to Rabbi Bun: If this is so, then even if one slaughters it (before its time) for itself in order to sprinkle its blood not for itself,⁵³ it should become, from the first moment, as if he slaughtered it (in silence) for itself and (intending to throw its blood) not for itself, and it too should be valid. Rabbi Abba Mari said: From where do we know that when one slaughters it (before its time) silently, in order to sprinkle its blood not for itself, that it is considered valid? (6b5)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

We mentioned that Yosef Hatzaddik is partially to blame for his own sale, since he instigated the matter by arousing his brother's jealousy. The Ksav Sofer (Al HaTorah) in Parshas Mishpotim (Shmos 22:23) writes a very similar thought. The Torah warns us not to afflict a widow or an orphan, and if they are afflicted and turn to Hashem, Hashem will hear their cries. Hashem will then become angry, and will kill those who

⁵² If someone slaughters a pesach-offering in silence (with no intention) before the afternoon of Erev Pesach, it is regarded as if he slaughtered it for what it was 'headed' for – which is a pesach-offering, and therefore it is invalid (for it's not the proper time); but, if he slaughters it "shelo lishmah" – not for the sake of the pesach, then the "shelo lishmah" uproots the presumed status of the pesach, and it is ruled to be valid. Rabbi Bun continued this logic to this case, and argued: a "shelo lishmah" intention should also be able to uproot an explicitly stated "lishmah" status!

⁵³ But rather for a shelamim-offering.



hurt these downtrodden people. Subsequently, the children of the oppressors will themselves become orphans, and their wives will be widows. The Ksav Sofer asks, isn't it obvious that if Hashem kills these men, then their children will become orphans, and their wives widows? He answers with the general rule that anyone who causes someone else to be punished, he himself will also be punished. The widows – who cried to Hashem after being afflicted – have inadvertently caused the oppressors to be killed by Hashem's wrath. Therefore, they themselves are now subject to punishment, and their children will too be orphaned.

DAILY MASHAL

Atonement of the Shekalim

The Shem mi'Shmuel explains why the commandment to us to bring shekalim could forestall the shekalim of Haman. We read concerning Amalek, "Asher karkha- who cooled you," (Dvarim, 25:18) and "they camped in Rephidim" (Shmot, 17:8); where the Jewish avodah became weakened and casual, then there came Amalek. Eisav, Amalek and Haman, were devoted to a cooling of the Avodah of Israel, to a cooling of the relationships of one Jew to the next and to the resultant separation of Israel from Hashem. We need to understand the discussion (Yerushalmi, Shekalim, 2, halachah 3; Also the Midrash Ki Tisah, 10), as to which sins the shekalim came to atone for. One said that it was for their error of the Golden Calf that they had made at midday while another said that that had been at the 6th hour of the day. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Rabbi Nechemiah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai, as they had transgressed the Ten Commandments, each one in Israel had to bring in atonement, a half shekel, that is a tenth of a gerah in weight. Rabbi Shimon Ben Levi taught that as they had collectively sinned by selling Rachel's first born for 20 pieces of silver, each descendant of the 10 brothers had to bring a coin, in memory of their share of the sale price, in atonement.

Those scholars that relate the shekalim to the error of the Golden Calf saw their test as being their inability to serve Hashem even without wisdom or knowledge [that is only

with their bodies]. Wisdom and knowledge were missing at that time, either because Satan had caused confusion and ignorance amongst Israel at the absence of Moshe that obviated their wisdom [Israel said, "We do not know what has happened to the man Moshe" (Shmot, 32:1)], or because the number 6 represents the unity of the diverse parts of our bodies, but does not include our wisdom, that is the innermost part of us, represented by the number 7. Rabbi Shimon ben Levi, who held that the shekel came to atone for the sale of Yosef, argues that that sin was one of the mind and the intellect. They had to judge him with their minds but there occurred a distortion in their intellectual wisdom that led to an error in judgment.

The two aspects that are contained in the shekalim will show that there is no difference between the Sages. There was the numerical element of shekalim and there was the element of the silver in them. The numerical element is reflected in the 6th hour and this refers to the chet haeigel. There is an insistence on silver in the shekalim; "All the hekdeishot may be redeemed [by payment with near money] except for shekalim that have to be brought in silver coins" (Bechorot, 72). This insistence on silver is a reminder of the knowledge and intellect involved in the sin of the selling of Yosef. The Maharal explains that "You shall love your G-d with all your might, meodekha", [that means as Rashi comments, 'with all your possessions'] refers to our minds, intellect and wisdom since our possessions are at the heart of everything and Mankind is immersed in their possessions. That is why they are called 'Kesef' since our kissuffim, all our yearnings, are for them.

Now we can understand the saying of our Sages, that Hashem commanded us to bring shekalim, to forestall the coins of Haman. In that period, the Jews had committed two sins; one with their bodies, in that they partook of the king's feast and one with their minds and intellect, in that they bowed to the idol. The shekalim atoned both for their bodily sin and for the intellectual one, since they combine both body and mind.