This is a measure that was used in the past, but no longer in the present. Rabbi Yohanan said: This is our measure today and it is not so old. The Gemara asks: Why does the *tanna* of the *babaita* call this measure *old* when it was still being used in his day?

The Gemara answers: Some say that this measure was originally small and it was made larger, and some say that after it was enlarged it was again made smaller, but not as small as it had been originally. Since this measure was not of the same size at all times, the *tanna* of the *babaita* was precise when he said that a *quarter-log* is equal to the old measure of one-eighth. So too, Rabbi Yohanan was precise when he said that this was the measure used in his day.

The Gemara asks: In terms of the measures currently in use, what is the measure of a cup* that holds a *quarter-log*? Rabbi Yosei in the name of Rabbi Yosei ben Pazi and Rabbi Yosei bar Beivai in the name of Rabbi Shmuel said: Two fingers long by two fingers wide by the height of one and a half fingers and one-third of a finger.

The Gemara previously discussed the measure of wine that determines liability if one carries it from one domain to another on Shabbat. There, the Gemara discussed wine in liquid form; here, the Gemara adds a parallel ruling with regard to congealed wine. It was taught in a *babaita*: The measure that determines liability for carrying from one domain to another congealed wine is an *olive-bulk*; this is the statement of Rabbi Nathan.

The Rabbis of Caesarea and Rabbi Yosei bar Beivai said in the name of Shmuel: These words of Rabbi Nathan follow the opinion of Rabbi Shimon in a mishna (Shabbat 76b). Just as Rabbi Shimon said there: The measure that determines liability for all liquids, including wine, is a *quarter-log*, so Rabbi Nathan said: When wine is in liquid form, the measure that determines liability for carrying it from one domain to another is a *quarter-log*; after it has congealed one is liable only if he carries out an *olive-bulk*, which is equivalent to a *quarter-log* of wine after it has congealed.

§ On a similar matter, Rabbi Simon said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: An incident is related with regard to the mule of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi that died of a wound, and the Sages deemed its blood ritually pure, i.e., free of the impurity of an unslaughtered animal carcass. They said that the blood of a carcass does not impart ritual impurity as does the carcass itself. And Rabbi Eliezer asked Rabbi Simon, who had reported this ruling: Up to how much blood from an animal carcass does not render one ritually impure? Did they deem it pure because it was less than a *quarter-log*, but had it been more than a *quarter-log* they would have deemed it impure?

And the Sages deemed its blood ritually pure — *תָּחְפָּשׁ* The impurity of an unslaughtered animal carcass is mentioned in several places in the Torah, but nowhere does the Torah specify the minimum measure of a carcass needed to impart impurity. The *halakha* was established that with regard to imparting ritual impurity, the measure of the flesh of a carcass is the same as the measure that determines liability for eating it, i.e., an *olive-bulk*. The impurity of the blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass is not explicitly stated in the Torah, and the Sages disagree about the matter in a *baraite* (Shabbat 77b). According to Beit Hillel, the blood imparts ritual impurity, whereas according to Beit Shammai it does not. The Sages discuss whether, even according to the opinion of Beit Shammai, the blood itself is pure, or whether it is pure only in the sense that it does not cause other items to be susceptible to impurity. The Sages also consider whether it is pure in any measure or only when it is less than an *olive-bulk*.

**Cup** — *כוס*: Cups were made of various materials, including silver, gold, glass, and clay. The cup is the smallest drinking vessel and can hold about a *quarter-log* of liquid.

**Congealed wine** — *יַיִן יַבֵּשׁ*: In certain places, e.g., on Mount Hermon, wine was covered with snow and allowed to congeal and freeze. The frozen wine would harden and resemble fgpu cakes in appearance. Wine was frozen in this manner to preserve it both so it would not turn sour and in order to raise its alcohol content, as when it froze, some of the water separated from the wine and turned into ice.

**HALAKHA**

The measure for carrying from one domain to another congealed wine is an *olive-bulk*. The measure that determines liability for carrying from one domain to another congealed wine on Shabbat is an *olive-bulk*, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Nathan (Rambam: Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhur Shabbat 18a).
The blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass...is ritually pure – רְבִּי אֲמַר לָךְ: דָּם נִשְׂנָא תְּלוּאִים רָצִיל. The blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass does not impart ritual impurity as does the carcass itself; rather, it is like impure liquids, which according to Torah law do not impart impurity to people or vessels. The halakha is in accordance with the testimony of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora (Rambam Sefer Tahanah, Hilkhot Shear Avot 1:4). The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh – דָּם כְּבָשֵׂרֵי מַחְשֵׁישׁ. The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh, i.e., it imparts ritual impurity through physical contact but does not render food susceptible to contracting impurity, in accordance with the baraita (Rambam Sefer Tahanah, Hilkhot Tumat Ohrin 1:3).

Rabbi Simon paid Rabbi Eliezer no attention and did not answer him, so Rabbi Eliezer went and asked Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, who said to him as follows. Up to a quarter-log of blood is pure; more than a quarter-log of blood is impure. Rabbi Elazar was displeased that Rabbi Simon had not fully reported the teaching to him, so that he had to go to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi to ask about it.

Rav Beivai was sitting and teaching this case of the mule from Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's household, in which the Sages ruled that the blood of a carcass does not render one impure. Rabbi Yitzhak bar Kahana wished to clarify the issue and said to him: Up to a quarter-log of blood is pure, but more than that is impure? Or did the Sages rule that the blood of a carcass is never ritually impure, whatever the measure may be?

The Gemara relates: In response to Rabbi Yitzhak bar Kahana's question, Rav Beivai kicked him. Rabbi Zerika said to him, i.e., to Rav Beivai: You kicked him because he asked you a question? He said to him: I kicked him because my mind was unsettled, and not because he did anything wrong.

Rav Beivai tries to explain his conduct: As Rabbi Hanan said: ‘And your life shall hang in doubt before you; and you shall fear night and day, and shall have no assurance of your life’ (Deuteronomy 28:66). This verse in the passage of rebuke refers to three increasingly harsh levels of poverty: ‘And your life shall hang in doubt before you’; this is one who buys wheat for a year, who has no financial security with regard to the following year. ‘And you shall fear night and day’; this is one who buys small amounts of wheat from a vendor, with the attendant concern that he might not have enough for the morrow. ‘And you shall have no assurance of your life’; this is one who buys bread from the baker – palto – and cannot afford to buy wheat in advance to assure even one future meal.

Rabbi Beivai concluded: And I am in the harshest state, as I rely on the baker. For this reason I did not have the presence of mind to respond appropriately to Rabbi Yitzhak bar Kahana’s question.

The Gemara asks: What then is the halakhic ruling regarding the ritual impurity of the blood of an animal carcass? In response, the Gemara quotes a mishna (Eduyot 8:1): Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora testified that the blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass is ritually pure, which implies that it is ritually pure regardless of the amount, even more than a quarter-log.

The Gemara rejects this answer: What does the mishna mean by ritually pure? That such blood is ritually pure in that it does not render an item susceptible to impurity. Even though blood is one of the seven liquids that render an item susceptible to ritual impurity, the blood of an animal carcass is not deemed blood for this purpose. But as for imparting ritual impurity by itself, the blood imparts ritual impurity, as does the carcass itself.

The Gemara asks: How can the words of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora be understood in this way? Didn’t we learn elsewhere in a mishna (Makkot 6:5): The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh; it imparts ritual impurity to items with which it comes into contact, but it does not render an item susceptible to impurity? And we have nothing else like it, i.e., there is no other liquid that imparts ritual impurity but does not render food susceptible to impurity. The implication is that the blood of an animal carcass would either both impart impurity and render an item susceptible to impurity or neither.

Ritually pure in that it does not render an item susceptible to impurity – דָּם נִשְׂנָא תְּלוּאִים רָצִיל: Food is susceptible to contracting ritual impurity only after it has come into contact with a liquid, through the direct intervention of its owner or with his approval. There are seven liquids that render food items liable to contract ritual impurity: (1) Water (see Leviticus 11:37–38); (2) dew; (3) wine; (4) honey; (5) oil; (6) blood; and (7) milk. The latter six liquids are listed in a mishna (Makkot 6:4a) and derived from biblical verses. The Gemara here indicates that the blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass is not blood that causes food to become susceptible to impurity. Only blood that is like water, i.e., the blood of a properly slaughtered animal, makes food susceptible to contracting ritual impurity. Blood of a carcass does not (Ramban HaShana).

The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh – דָּם מַחְשֵׁישׁ. The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh, i.e., it imparts ritual impurity through physical contact but does not render food susceptible to contracting impurity, in accordance with the baraita (Rambam Sefer Tahanah, Hilkhot Tumat Ohrin 1:3).
The Gemara answers: When the mishna said that we have nothing else like a creeping animal, it meant that we have nothing else like it with regard to the measure required for its blood to confer impurity; the measure of a creeping animal's blood is the same for both: The measure required for its imparting ritual impurity is such that its blood imparts ritual impurity like its flesh, i.e., in the measure of a lentil. This is not the case with an unslaughtered animal carcass, the flesh of which imparts ritual impurity in the measure of an olive-bulk, but its blood imparts impurity in the measure of a quarter-log. Consequently, there is no contradiction between the mishna in tractate Makkot and the testimony of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora.

Rabbi Yosei said: Two amora'im disagree about this matter. One said a quarter-log of this blood renders one ritually impure, and one said that even after contact with this blood, one remains ritually pure. The one who said it is impure follows the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in a mishna in Edyot 5:1. Rabbi Yehuda maintains there that this issue is the subject of a dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel. The halakha would follow the opinion of Beit Hillel, which is that carcass blood does confer impurity. And the one who said ritually pure holds like the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora, who testified (Edyot 8:1) that the blood of an animal carcass is ritually pure.

Rav Avduma of the descenders, i.e., travelers from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, bringing with them the Torah taught in Eretz Yisrael, said to him: And it is right. That which you explained is correct, as Rabbi Yehuda was the halakhic authority for the house of the Nasi. Rabbi Yehuda ruled then that the blood of the dead mule was pure only because there was less than a quarter-log of it.

§ The Mishna taught that the one who collects the funds from the Temple treasury chamber must not enter the chamber wearing clothes that could arouse suspicion, as perhaps one day he will become poor and people will say that he was reduced to poverty because he had stolen shekels from the chamber. Rabbi Yishmael taught a similar halakha in a baraita: One who is curly haired must not collect funds from the Temple treasury chamber because of the suspicion that he will hide shekels from the chamber in his curls. It was taught in another baraita: The Temple treasurers would untangle [mefaspeis]: the matted locks of the one who collected the funds from the chamber after he exited the chamber, to ascertain that no coins were hidden in his hair.

It was taught in yet another baraita that deals with a similar suspicion: They would converse with the one collecting the funds from the chamber from the time he entered the chamber until the time he exited it, so that he should not be able to hide money from the chamber in his mouth. The Gemara asks: Why not let him fill his mouth with water, so that it would be impossible for him to insert money into his mouth, and then he would not have to speak? Rabbi Tanhuma said: He cannot fill his mouth with water because of the blessing that he must recite before collecting the funds from the chamber.

§ Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahman said in the name of Rabbi Yo-natan: We find in the Torah, in the Prophets, and in the Writings that a person must appear justified before people as he must appear justified before the Omnipresent. From where in the Torah is this derived? As it is written: “And you shall be guiltless before the Lord and before Israel” (Numbers 32:22).
From where in the Prophets is this derived? As it is written: “The mighty One, God, the Lord, He knows, and Israel shall know” (Joshua 22:22).
From where in the Writings is this derived? As it is written: “So shall you find grace and good understanding in the sight of God and man” (Proverbs 3:4).

The measure required for imparting ritual impurity is such that its blood imparts ritual impurity like its flesh – [םיושע תועש ת𝑗א אאש ברקדר]. The measure for the impurity of a creeping animal is derived from the verses dealing with these impurities. One verse states: “Whoever touches them, when they are dead, shall be unclean” (Leviticus 11:33). The word “them” implies that creeping animals impart impurity only when they are whole. However, the next verse states: “And whoever falls upon them of them, when they are dead, shall be unclean” (Leviticus 11:32). The phrase “of them” implies that even parts of creeping animals impart impurity. The Sages reconciled these two seemingly contradictory verses as follows: Even parts of creeping animals impart impurity, but only if they amount to the measure of the smallest whole creeping animal. The Sages established this measure as the size of a lentil, since the skin, which is the smallest of these creeping animals, begins its life at the size of a lentil (Nazir 52a). The Gemara here concludes that the measure for the impurity of its flesh is the same as the measure for the impurity of its blood.
Gamliel Zuga asked Rabbi Yosei bar Rabbi Bun: Which of these verses is the clearest of all the sources that one must be blameless even in the eyes of man? The three proof texts say more or less the same thing; which is the most unambiguous of the three? Rabbi Yosei bar Rabbi Bun said to him: The verse “And you shall be guiltless before the Lord and before Israel” is the most unequivocal of all.

HALAKHA 3 · MISHNA In order to indicate the importance that was attached to the ceremony of the collection of the Temple treasury chamber, the mishna relates that the members of the house of Rabban Gamliel desired that their shekels be the ones collected from the chamber and used for the purchase of the communal offerings. Each of them would therefore come to the Temple specifically on the day of the ceremony of the collection of the chamber, enter the chamber with his shekel between his fingers, and toss it in front of the one collecting the money so that he would see it and place it in the basket containing the money to be taken out of the chamber. Understanding what was happening, the one collecting the money from the chamber would purposely push this shekel into the basket, so that it would later be used to buy communal offerings.

The one collecting the funds from the chamber may not begin to collect the money until he asks the Temple treasurers three times: Shall I collect the funds, and they say to him: Collect them, collect them, collect them, three times.

The coins were stored in the Temple treasury in three large baskets, each measuring nine se’ah. In the collection of the chamber ceremony, coins were removed from these baskets and placed in smaller baskets of three se’ah each that were marked with letters (see the previous mishna ondaf 8a). After he collected the funds from the first large basket and put them into one of the smaller baskets labeled with the letter alef, he immediately covered with a leather cover the large basket from which he had removed the money. After collecting funds from the second large basket, he covered it with a leather cover as well. But after collecting funds from the third large basket, he did not cover it.

The mishna asks: Why did he cover the first two baskets? In order to mark them as already having had funds collected from them. In this way, there was no concern that perhaps he would forget and once again collect funds from a basket from which funds had already been collected.

The mishna specifies the intent of the one collecting the funds from the baskets as he does so: He collected funds from the first basket on behalf of the people living in Eretz Yisra’el; from the second basket on behalf of the people living in the cities near Eretz Yisra’el; and from the third basket on behalf of the people living in Babylonia, and on behalf of the people living in Media, and on behalf of the people living in the distant countries.

GEMARA It was taught in the mishna that the members of the house of Rabban Gamliel would arrange that their shekels be the ones collected from the chamber and used for the purchase of the communal offerings. The Gemara asks: If there were two piles of produce, and one separated teruma from one pile on behalf of the other, hasn’t he exempted with this teruma the other pile as well? When tithe produce, it is not necessary to separate teruma from each pile. It suffices to set aside an appropriate measure of teruma from one of them, and this counts as teruma for the other as well. Here too, the shekels are collected from the chamber not only on behalf of those who contributed those specific shekels, but even for those whose shekels were not collected. If so, why did the members of the house of Rabban Gamliel make such efforts to ensure that their shekels be the ones collected from the chamber?
The Gemara answers: Even so, they got satisfaction from the fact that the communal offering was necessarily brought from their shekels first. For this reason, they exerted themselves to ensure that their shekels were collected from the chamber.

The Gemara records several halakhot dealing with the collection of funds from the Temple treasury chamber. It was taught in a baraita: If the one collecting the funds from the chamber mistakenly removed the leather covers that he had placed on the large baskets, so that now he doesn’t know from which baskets shekels have already been collected and from which they have not yet been collected, all the shekels in the uncovered baskets take on the status of the remainder of the chamber.

It was taught in another baraita: The third collection of funds from the Temple treasury chamber that took place half a month before Sukkot was the most abundant of all, as it contained both isteteri, small coins of gold, and darics, large coins of gold.

It was taught in yet another baraita: He collected funds from the first basket on behalf of the people living in Eretz Yisrael and on behalf of all of Israel; from the second basket on behalf of the people living in the cities [kerakim] near Eretz Yisrael and on behalf of all of Israel; and from the third basket on behalf of the people living in Babylonia and Media, and on behalf of those who dwelled in the distant countries, and on behalf of all of Israel.

The Gemara discusses the order in which the funds are taken from the baskets. It was taught in a baraita: After shekels were first taken from the first basket labeled with an alef, although shekels still remain in the first basket, shekels are taken from the second basket labeled with a bet. After shekels were taken from second basket, although shekels still remain in the second basket, shekels are taken from the third basket labeled with a gimel.

If the third basket is completely emptied, he goes back to take from the second basket. If the second basket is completely emptied, he goes back to take from the first basket. If all three baskets are completely emptied, he goes back to the chamber and takes from the shekels that have arrived since the last time shekels were collected from the chamber. He does not take from the shekels that remained in the chamber at the previous ceremony of collection into the baskets, as those coins acquired at that point the status of leftover shekels, which do not have sanctity.

Rabbi Meir says: He goes back to take from the leftover shekels. Because Rabbi Meir said: The halakhot of misusing consecrated property apply even to the leftover shekels, as they remain in their sanctified state. Why so? Perhaps they will be needed in the end, since if the shekels collected from the chamber are depleted, the leftover can be used for the purchase of communal offerings.

Take on the status of the remainder of the chamber – בְּהַחֲלֹק הַגְּדוּל הַקְּרֵיָּה בְּהַחֲלֹק הַגְּדוּל הַקְּרֵיָּה
Shekels remaining after all the collection of the chamber ceremonies have been performed are called the remainder of the chamber. These are no longer consecrated for the purchase of communal offerings and are used for building and maintaining communal structures in Jerusalem. In this case, if the leather cover has been accidentally removed, there is no way of ascertaining whether the shekels have already been collected from that basket and no further shekels may be collected from that basket for the purchase of communal offerings.

It was the most abundant of all – בְּהַחֲלֹק הַגְּדוּל הַקְּרֵיָּה בְּהַחֲלֹק הַגְּדוּל הַקְּרֵיָּה
Since this was the last time that funds were removed from the chamber, it regularly included the shekels of those who dwelled in distant places, who would be late in bringing their shekels. As the mishna in the previous chapter explained (Gittos 5a), the Sages permitted those living in distant places to combine their half shekels into larger gold coins in order to make it easier to bring them to Jerusalem. Consequently, many of the coins removed on this occasion were of gold (Tikkun Hadatan).

Although shekels remain in the first basket, shekels are taken from the second basket — רְשִׁית אֲלֵילָה בְּבֵית אֶלֶף
The money in the first basket would sometimes suffice for the purchase of all the communal offerings for that year. But if all the shekels were taken from the first basket, no shekels would have to be taken from the other baskets. In such a case, those whose shekels were in the second or third baskets would not be included in the communal offerings. For this reason, the Sages said that funds should be taken from all three baskets, so that all of Israel’s shekels would be a part in the communal offerings (Rabbenu Meshulam; Tikkun Hadatan).

The halakhot of misusing consecrated property apply to the leftover shekels — מֵעֲלֵיהֶן מֵעֲלֵיהֶן
It is a Torah prohibition to misuse consecrated property (see Leviticus 5:14–16). The details of these halakhot are spelled out in tractate Me’ila. Anyone who unwittingly benefits from a consecrated object or damages it through illicit use is guilty of misuse of a consecrated object. He must repay the Temple for the loss he causes or the benefit he gains, plus pay a fine of one-fifth of the value of the loss or the benefit. He must also bring a special sacrifice, a guilt-offering, for the misuse. Ordinarily, a consecrated object that was misused loses its sanctity, and that sanctity is transferred to the money that the offender returns to the Temple.

According to some authorities, one who intentionally misuses a consecrated object is liable to receive death at the hand of Heaven. Others maintain that he is liable to receive lashes. He does not achieve atonement through an offering and the fine of an additional fifth.
And so Rabbi Pines has ben Yair would say – יִרְאַת הַכֹּהֵן לִידֵי כֶּסֶם. Different versions of this homily, attributed to Rabbi Pines has ben Yair, appear in a number of places in the Talmud (see Avoda Zara 20b and Mishna Yota 9:5, where this baraita has been appended to the mishna). In other versions, the teaching begins with the statement that Torah study leads to zehut, vigilance. The Ramhal, whose master work, Mesillat Yesharim, is a developed explication of this baraita, explains that although many versions do not have this statement, it is obvious that the study of Torah is the underpinning of perfection of the individual. He writes that it is left out here because it is qualitatively different from the other traits in the list, as they make up a hierarchy of spiritual virtues.

Cleanliness – ניקיון: This means cleanliness from all iniquity (Rashi on Avoda Zara 20b) and from all evil thoughts (Rashi on Rava): Rabbi Yaakov Emden adds that this also includes cleanliness of body and clothing, which is also a contributing factor to the perfection of one’s soul.

Purity – קת-death. Rashi explains that purity is a more elevated attribute than cleanliness, as purity connotes absolute cleanliness, free of any blemish whatsoever (Avoda Zara 20b). Rabbi Yaakov Emden understands that purity is referring to matters of purity prescribed by the Torah, as opposed to matters that one would arrive at by reason, as is the case with cleanliness. Pious men of the early generations were meticulous about maintaining ritual purity, as it can purify the soul. A later authority (Responsa Maharashdam, Orlah Hayim 17) explains that purity here is referring to conduct such as was practiced by the pious people, who ate their non-sanctified food in a state of ritual purity.

Humility leads to fear of sin, for it is when one recognizes his inferiority, he becomes more fearful of sin and is careful to avoid temptation. Fear of sin leads to piety, as one begins to impose upon himself stringencies beyond the letter of the law. Piety leads to the holy spirit, because when one acts in a manner that goes beyond the letter of the law, Heaven acts with him in a way that is not natural to man, and informs him of the secrets of the Torah through divine inspiration. The holy spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, because the spirit of holiness and purity that descend upon him enter the bones of the deceased and resurrect them. The resurrection of the dead that will precede the arrival of the Messiah leads to the coming of the Prophet Elijah, of blessed memory, who will herald the upcoming redemption.

HALAKHA

Cleanliness leads to purity – ניקיון מקבץ י럿 ל администраци: Although according to the letter of the law it is permitted to eat ritually impure foods and drink ritually impure beverages when one will not be entering the Temple or coming into contact with holy objects, the pious men of the early generations ate their ordinary food in ritual purity and avoided impurity throughout their lives. They were called pious, meaning those who engage in perisha, abstinence. Abstinence leads to purity of the body, and purity of the body leads to holiness of the soul, and holiness of the soul causes one to resemble the Divine Presence. This is in accordance with the words of Rabbi Pines has ben Yair in the Jerusalem Talmud (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Halakhot Tuman Okhalim 17:12, and the comment of the Kesef Mishneh).

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Pines has ben Yair – רבי פינחס בן יאיר: A Sage of the Mishna, Rabbi Pines has ben Yair was recognized as a miracle worker and one of the most righteous men of all generations. Rabbi Pines has was a contemporary of Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai. According to one reading of the Gemara, he was his son-in-law. According to other sources, he appears to have been his father-in-law. He was admired by all the Sages even in his lifetime. So many miraculous tales are told about him that the Talmud says: How much greater was this man than Moses our master.

The Talmud relates that Rabbi Pines has ben Yair’s donkey would refuse to eat of grain that had not been tithe (see 150).

Few of Rabbi Pines has’s teachings have been preserved. The most famous of them is what he states here about the steps that one must take in order to perfect his character and ultimately reach prophecy and the coming of the Messiah.

Sin leads to cleanliness – סינ מקבץ ירות מקבץ ירות מקבץ ירות מקבץ ירות מקבץ ירות מקבץ ירות: The Talmud (see Ya’akov Emden understands that purity is referring to matters of purity prescribed by the Torah, as opposed to matters that one would arrive at by reason, as is the case with cleanliness. Pious men of the early generations were meticulous about maintaining ritual purity, as it can purify the soul. A later authority (Responsa Maharashdam, Orlah Hayim 17) explains that purity here is referring to conduct such as was practiced by the pious people, who ate their non-sanctified food in a state of ritual purity.

Humility leads to fear of sin, for it is when one recognizes his inferiority, he becomes more fearful of sin and is careful to avoid temptation. Fear of sin leads to piety, as one begins to impose upon himself stringencies beyond the letter of the law. Piety leads to the holy spirit, because when one acts in a manner that goes beyond the letter of the law, Heaven acts with him in a way that is not natural to man, and informs him of the secrets of the Torah through divine inspiration. The holy spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, because the spirit of holiness and purity that descend upon him enter the bones of the deceased and resurrect them. The resurrection of the dead that will precede the arrival of the Messiah leads to the coming of the Prophet Elijah, of blessed memory, who will herald the upcoming redemption.

The Gemara adds proof texts for each of the previous statements: Alacrity leads to cleanliness of the soul, as it is written: “And when he has made an end of atoning” (Leviticus 16:20): “He has made an end” denotes alacrity; since one hastens to bring the process to conclusion, he achieves atonement, which cleanses the souls of sinners of their iniquities. Cleanliness leads to purity, as it is written with regard to the offering of a woman brings after her days of impurity and purity that follow childbirth (Leviticus 12): “And the priest shall make atonement for her, and she shall be pure” (Leviticus 12:8). Once she finishes the process of her atonement, that is to say, once she cleanses herself of sin, she reaches purity.
Purity leads to holiness, as it is written with regard to the High Priest’s sprinkling of the blood of his bull and goat offerings on the golden altar on Yom Kippur: “And he shall purify it, and hallow it” (Leviticus 16:39), teaching that purity is followed by holiness. Holiness leads to humility, as it is written: “For thus says the High and Lofty One that inhabits eternity, Whose name is Holy: I dwell on high and in a holy place, yet with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit” (Isaiah 57:15). God’s holiness is drawn to a contrite and humble spirit.

Humility leads to fear of sin, as it is written: “The reward of humility is the fear of the Lord” (Proverbs 22:4). Fear of sin leads to piety, as it is written: “But the loving-kindness [hesed] of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon those who fear Him” (Psalms 103:17). The recognition of God’s loving-kindness indicates piety [hasid], which results from fear of God.

Piety leads to the holy spirit, as it is written: “Then You spoke in vision to Your pious ones” (Psalms 89:20). The holy spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, as it is written: “And I shall put My spirit in you, and you shall live” (Ezekiel 37:14). The resurrection of the dead leads to the coming of the Prophet Elijah, of blessed memory, as it is written: “Behold, I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord” (Malachi 3:23). The day referred to here is the day of the resurrection of the dead.

The Gemara concludes the chapter with a different discussion of virtues: It was taught in a baraita in the name of Rabbi Meir: Anyone who lives permanently in Eretz Yisrael, and speaks the holy tongue, and eats the fruits of Eretz Yisrael in purity, and recites Shema in the morning and in the evening, will receive the tidings and assurances that he is one who has merited of the World-to-Come.
HALAKHA 1 - MISHNA At certain times of the year, half-shekels that had been donated to the Temple and stored in a chamber in the Temple were collected in order to be used for various purposes. The mishna asks: The collection of half-shekels, what would they do with it? They would purchase animals for the daily offerings, which were offered each morning and afternoon; and for the additional offerings, which were offered on Shabbat, the New Moon, and Festivals; and wine for their libations; barley for the omer meal-offering; and wheat for both the two loaves offered on Shavuot and the shewbread; and animals for all the communal offerings.

The guards of the sephrin, grain that grew without being purposely planted, during the Sabbatical Year; ensured that people did not take this ownerless grain, so that it remained available to be used for the omer and the offering of the two loaves. They collect their wages from the collection of the Temple treasury chamber. Rabbi Yosei says: One who so desires may even volunteer his services and guard the grain as an unpaid bailee. The Rabbis said to him: Even you must say that the omer and the two loaves come only

The collection of half-shekels, what would they do with it – מיסקנות פירות יבששים נטלי כך מיסקנות מהתரומות, והיינו owners which they would salt the offerings. They also used this money to purchase wood if not enough wood had been donated to the Temple, to buy the ingredients for the incense and the shewbread, and even to pay the wages for those who prepared them. Additionally, they purchased the omer offering, the two loaves, the red heffer, the scapegoat, and the strip of scarlet wool that was tied to its head on Yom Kippur. This is in accordance with the mishna and Gemara (Ketubot 106a) as well as other sources (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim 4:5).

The guards of the sephrin during the Sabbatical Year – המיסקנות הפרחים שלפניו הוא אומボー, שהם שומר על הַפָּנִים והמהiores מ_trees וברכות על הַפָּנִים והמהiores ממשים, והם קבליות על חליפית אליהם: The guards of the sephrin during the Sabbatical Year. They would not allow anyone to volunteer his services to guard the sephrin, due to the concern that others would forcefully take the produce from them. Therefore, the Sages instituted that the watchmen receive their wages from the Temple treasury, so that people would respect their office and refrain from taking the produce they were guarding (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim 4:6).

HALAKHA

The omer –יסקנות: The omer is a meal-offering that was offered every year on the sixteenth of Nisan from an omer, i.e., one-tenth of an ephah, of barley. The priest took a handful of the flour and burned it on the altar, while the rest was given to the priests to eat. Once the omer offering is brought, it is permitted to eat from the new crop of grain that had grown that year. Until then, eating from the new crop is prohibited by Torah law (see Leviticus 23:10–14).

The two loaves –两点א: The two loaves were offered in the Temple on Shavuot. They were made from the new crop of wheat that had grown that year. The loaves were leavened bread, and each one consisted of an omer of fine flour. The loaves were not offered on the altar; rather, they were waved in the four directions as well as up and down. Along with these loaves, a bull, two rams, and seven sheep were sacrificed as burnt-offerings; two sheep were sacrificed as peace-offerings; and a ram was sacrificed as a sin-offering. After all of these offerings were sacrificed, the priests were permitted to eat the two loaves.

The shewbread – השביה. The shewbread consisted of the twelve loaves that were placed on the golden table inside the Sanctuary. When the priests arranged the shewbread on the table on Shabbat, they placed two bowls of frankincense on it as well. The following Shabbat, when they removed the bread, they offered the frankincense and divided the shewbread among the priests. The Hebrew name for the shewbread, lehem happidam, is derived from the word panim, which can refer to walls or corners. It is a reference to the unusual shape of the bread (Menahot 96a; see Rashi there). Alternatively, its name is derived from the word penim inside, as the shewbread was placed inside the Sanctuary (Hakittuv VeHokabbold). It is also known as the lehem hatarid, the continuous bread, as it was in the Sanctuary continuously.

And all the communal offerings – כל דבר התערובות: Included in this category is the incense as well as the wages for those who prepared it (Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura; Korban HaEida). The same is true for the salt that was used to salt the offerings and any wood that had not been donated privately for the pyre on the altar and had to be purchased with communal funds (Me’iri).

NOTES