

הַיְשָׁנָה. אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הַדִּין דִּידָן הוּא, וְלָמָּה קָרִי לֵיהּ עֲתִיקָה מִן בְּגִין דְּהָדָה בְּיוֹמֵי?

אֵית דְּאָמְרִי: דְּהָדָה זְעִירָא וְרַבְתָּא, וְאֵית דְּאָמְרִי: דְּאִזְעִירָא, וְלֹא אִזְעִירָא כְּמָה דְּהָדָה.

כְּמָה הוּא שִׁיעוּר שֶׁל כּוֹס? רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בֶן פְּזִי וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בַר בִּיבִי בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל: אֶצְבְּעִים עַל אֶצְבְּעִים עַל רוּם אֶצְבַּע וּמְחֻצָּה וּשְׁלִישׁ אֶצְבַּע.

(תַּנִּי: יָבֵשׁ כְּזֵית, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי נִתְּן.)

רַבְּנָן דְּקֵיסְרִי וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בַר בִּיבִי בְּשֵׁם שְׁמוּאֵל: אֲתֵיָא דְרַבִּי נִתְּן כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן. כְּמָה דְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אָמַר בְּרַבִּיעִית – כֵּן אָמַר רַבִּי נִתְּן בְּרַבִּיעִית, לְכַשִּׁיקְרָשׁ וַיְהִי בּוֹ כְּזֵית.

רַבִּי סִימוֹן בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי: מַעֲשֵׂה בְּפִרְדַּת רַבִּי שְׁמַתָּה וְטָהְרוּ אֶת דְּמָה מִשּׁוּם נְבִילָה. וְשָׂאֵל רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אֶת רַבִּי סִימוֹן: עַד כְּמָה?

This is a measure that was used in the past, but no longer in the present. **Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is our measure today and it is not so old.** The Gemara asks: **Why does the *tanna* of the *baraita* 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 *baraita* was precise when he said that a quarter-*log* is equal to the old measure of one-eighth. So too, Rabbi Yoḥanan 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^b 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 *baraita*: The measure that determines liability for carrying from one domain to another congealed wine is an olive-bulk;^h this is the statement of Rabbi Natan.**

The Rabbis of Caesarea and Rabbi Yosei bar Beivai said in the name of Shmuel: These words of **Rabbi Natan 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 Natan 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^b 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,ⁿ 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?**

BACKGROUND

Cup – כּוֹס: 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.



Glass cups and pitcher from the talmudic period

Congeaed wine – יַיִן קָרוֹשׁ: 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 fig 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.



Snowy Mount Hermon as seen from Mount Bental

HALAKHA

The measure for carrying from one domain to another congealed wine is an olive-bulk – יָבֵשׁ כְּזֵית: 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 Natan (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 18:2).

NOTES

וְטָהְרוּ – אֶת דְּמָה: 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 *baraita* (*Shabbat* 77a). 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.

PERSONALITIES

Rav Beivai – רב ביבי: An amora from the third generation in Eretz Yisrael, Rav Beivai was primarily a student of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish. He had a close relationship with Rabbi Ami, Rabbi Asi, and Rabbi Abbahu. According to the Gemara here and elsewhere (see Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbat 8:1; see Menahot 103b), Rabbi Beivai was desperately poor, to the extent that he claimed that the following verse applied to him: “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). He is sometimes confused with the Babylonian amora'im Rav Beivai and Rav Beivai bar Abaye.

BACKGROUND

Vendor [sidki] – סדקי: The term sidki is usually referring to a peddler who sells small, inexpensive notions such as needles for sewing or knitting. Ordinarily, he travels from place to place and sells his wares in small towns. In cities, he goes house to house. In the context of this passage, the word sidki is referring to a retailer who sells his merchandise in small quantities.

LANGUAGE

Baker [paltor] – פלטור: From the Greek πωλητής, polètèr, which denotes a shopkeeper, one who sells various items. In this context, the term is referring to a baker who sells what he bakes.

HALAKHA

The blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass... is ritually pure – דם נבילה... הוא טהור: 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 Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot 1:4).

The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh – דם השרץ כבשרו: 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 Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin 10:3).

וְלֹא אֲשַׁגְחַת בֵּיהּ וְשָׁאַל לְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי, וְאָמַר לֵיהּ: עַד רְבִיעִית – טְהוֹר, וְיִתֵּר מִרְבִּיעִית – טָמֵא. וּבְאֵשׁ לְרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר עַל דְּלָא חִזֵּר לֵיהּ רַבִּי סִימוֹן שְׂמוּעָתָא.

רב ביבי היה יתיב מתני הדין עובדא. אמר ליה רבי יצחק בר בהנה: עד רביעית – טהור, יותר מכאן – טמא?

ובעט ביה. אמר ליה רבי זריקא: בגין דשאל לך את בעט ביה? אמר ליה: בגין דלא הות דעתי בי בעיטנא ביה.

דאמר רבי חנן: והיו חייך תלואים לך מנגד – זה שלוקח חטים לשנה, ויפחדת לילה ויום – זה הלוקח מן הסדקי, ולא תאמין בחיך – זה הלוקח מן הפלטור.

ואנא סמיכנא אפלטור.

ומהו כדון? העיד רבי יהושע בן פתורה על דם נבילה שהוא טהור.

מהו טהור – טהור מלהכשיר, אבל לטמות מטמא.

תמן תנינן: דם השרץ כבשרו מטמא ואינו מכשיר, ואין לנו כיוצא בו.

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 Beivai⁷ 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 Yitzḥak 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 Yitzḥak 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 Ḥanan 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,⁸ 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 [paltor]¹ 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 Yitzḥak 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 (Eduyyot 8:1): Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora testified that the blood of an unslaughtered animal carcass is ritually pure,⁴ 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.⁵ 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 (Makhshirin 6:5): The blood of a creeping animal is like its flesh;⁶ 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.

NOTES

Ritually pure in that it does not render an item susceptible to impurity – טהור מלהכשיר: 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 (Makhshirin 6:4) 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 (Korban HaEida).

The measure required for imparting ritual impurity is such that its blood imparts ritual impurity like its flesh – וְשִׁיעוֹר – טוּמְאָתוֹ שְׂדֵמוֹ מְטֵמֵא כְּבָשָׂר׃ 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 11:31). The word “them” implies that creeping animals impart impurity only when they are whole. However, the next verse states: “And whoever falls upon him 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 skink, 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.



Skink eggs. The coin gives a sense of the skink's size when it hatches.



Blue-tongued skink displaying its tongue

Because of the blessing – מִפְּנֵי הַבְּרָכָה׃ The blessing recited over the collection of funds from the Temple treasury chamber is the same as the blessing recited when separating *teruma* from produce: Blessed are You, Lord our God, King of the universe, Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us concerning *teruma*. The Sages learned from the verse: “Let my mouth be filled with Your praise” (Psalms 71:8) that one's mouth must be empty when he recites a blessing (*Yalkut Shimoni* 803; see *Berakhot* 51a). Therefore, the one collecting the funds from the chamber cannot fill his mouth with water when he enters the chamber to collect the funds.

HALAKHA

One who is curly haired must not collect funds – קוּוֹץ לֹא יִתְרוֹם׃ One who is curly haired must not collect funds from the Temple treasury chamber, so that people will not suspect him of having taken shekels from the chamber and hiding them in his hair. This is in accordance with the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Shekalim* 2:10, and the comments of the Ra'avad and *Kesef Mishneh*).

LANGUAGE

Untangle [*mefaspesin*] – מִפְּסָפְסִין׃ This quadrilateral, four-letter root, *psps*, stems from the trilateral, three-letter root, *psh*, which means to divide something into its parts. In connection to hair, the word denotes the separation of hairs that have become tangled.

וְשִׁיעוֹר טוּמְאָתוֹ שְׂדֵמוֹ מְטֵמֵא כְּבָשָׂר׃

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,**^N 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, while its blood imparts impurity in the measure of a quarter-*log*. Consequently, there is no contradiction between the mishna in tractate *Makhshirin* and the testimony of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Petora.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי: פְּלִיגִי בֵּה תֵרִין אַמּוֹרָאִין, חַד אָמַר: טְמֵא, וְחַד אָמַר: טָהוֹר. מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר טְמֵא – כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה. וּמֵאֵן דְּאָמַר טָהוֹר – כְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן פֶּתוּרָה.

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 *Eduyyot* 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 (*Eduyyot* 8:1) that the blood of an animal carcass is ritually pure.**

אָמַר לִיה רַב אַבְדוּמָה דְּמִן נַחוּתָה: וְיָאוּת, דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה מוֹרִינָא דְּבִי נְשִׂיאָה הָוָה.

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.

”שְׂמָא יַעֲנִי וְיֵאמְרוּ” כּוּ. תֵּנִי רַבִּי שְׂמַעְיָאֵל: קוּוֹץ לֹא יִתְרוֹם מִפְּנֵי הַחֶשֶׁד. תֵּנִי: הַגּוֹבְרִין הֵיוּ מִפְּסָפְסִין בְּקִילְקִין.

§ 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^H 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 [*mefaspesin*]^L 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.

תֵּנִי: מְדַבְרִין הָיוּ עִמּוֹ מִשְׁעָה שֶׁהוּא נִכְנָס עַד שְׁעָה שֶׁהוּא יוֹצֵא. וְיִמְלֵא פּוּמִיָּה מוֹיֵי אָמַר רַבִּי תַנְחוּמָא: מִפְּנֵי הַבְּרָכָה.

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^N that he must recite before collecting the funds from the chamber.

רַבִּי שְׂמוּאֵל בַּר נַחְמָן בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: בְּתוֹרָה וּבְנְבִיאִים וּבְכְתוּבִים מְצָאוּנוּ שְׂאָדָם צְרוּךְ לְצֵאת יְדֵי הַבְּרִיּוֹת בְּדֶרֶךְ שֶׁהוּא צְרוּךְ לְצֵאת יְדֵי הַמְּקוֹם. בְּתוֹרָה מִנֵּן – דְּכִתְבִּיב: ”וְהֵייתֶם נְקִיִּים מִה’ וּמִיִּשְׂרָאֵל”, בְּנְבִיאִים מִנֵּן – דְּכִתְבִּיב: ”אֵל אֱלֹהִים ה’ וְגו’ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא יְדַע”. בְּכְתוּבִים מִנֵּן – דְּכִתְבִּיב: ”וּמִצָּא חֵן וְשִׂכַל טוֹב בְּעֵינֵי אֱלֹהִים וְאָדָם”.

§ Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahman said in the name of Rabbi Yonatan: **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).

גמליאל זוגא שאל לרבי יוסי בר רבי
בון: איזהו המחזור שבכולם? אמר ליה:
"והייתם נקיים מזה ומישראל".

הלכה ג מתני' של בית רבן גמליאל
היה נכנס ושקלו בין אצבעותיו וזרקו
לפני התורם, והתורם מתכווין ודחפו
לתוך הקופה.

אין התורם תורם עד שהוא אומר להם
"אתרום" והן אומרות לו "תרום, תרום,
תרום" שלש פעמים.

תרם את הראשונה וחיפה בקטבליאות,
השנייה וחיפה בקטבליאות, השלישית
לא היה מחפה.

ולמה היה מחפה – שמא ישבח ויתרום
מן הדבר התרום.

תרם את הראשונה לשים ארץ ישראל,
והשנייה לשים כרבים המוקפין לה,
והשלישית לשים בבל ולשים מדי ולשים

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'a*. In the collection of the chamber ceremony, coins were removed from these baskets and placed in smaller baskets of three *se'a* each that were marked with letters (see the previous mishna on *daf* 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 Yisrael; from the second basket on behalf of the people living in the cities near Eretz Yisrael; 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 tithing 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?

מדינות הרחוקות.

גמ' של בית רבן גמליאל וכו'. אילו היו
שני בריים ותרם מאחד מהן על חבירו,
שמא לא פטר חבירו?

Isteriot – אִסְטֵרְיֹאוֹת: The plural of *istera*, a half-dinar of bronze. From the Greek, *στατήρ*, *statēr*, a Greek coin. When these coins were made of gold, they were called Tyrian money and were equal in value to a *sela*, or four dinars. When they were made of bronze, they were called money of the state and were worth one-eighth of the stated value of the large coins, or a half-dinar.



Gold *statēr* from Lampsacus

Cities [kerakim] – קְרָכִים: A *kerakh* is a large city, usually surrounded by a wall. Some maintain that the word stems from the Greek *κράσις*, *kharax*, which is referring to a place fortified by beams. Others argue that it derives from a Semitic, or perhaps Assyrian root, and that it is related to the root *krkh*, encirclement.

HALAKHA

If all three baskets are completely emptied – שְׁלֵמוֹ שְׁלֹשֶׁת תְּבִיאוֹת: The Rambam rules that if the funds in the three large baskets are depleted and will not suffice for all the communal offerings, funds are taken from the remainder of the chamber for this purpose, in accordance with the sole dissenting opinion of Rabbi Meir. The *Kesef Mishne* explains why the Rambam does not rule in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 2:6, and the comment of the *Kesef Mishne*).

הַנַּחַת רוּחַ הָיָא לָהֶם שְׂלָא יְהֵא קְרָבָן מִתְקַרְבָּא אֲלָא מִשְׁלֵהֵן תַּחְלָה.

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.

תַּנִּי: שְׂמַט אֶת הַקְּטֵבִלְאוֹת – נַעֲשׂוּ כּוֹלֵן שִׁירִים.

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.^N

תַּנִּי: שְׁלִישִׁית הִיא הֵיטָה עֲשִׂירָה שְׁבַבְלוֹן, שְׁהִיוּ בֵּה אִסְטֵרְיֹאוֹת שֶׁל זְהוּב וְדִרְבָּנוֹת שֶׁל זְהוּב.

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,^N as it contained both *isteriot*,^L small coins of gold, and *darics*, large coins of gold.

תַּנִּי: תָּרַם אֶת הָרֵאשׁוֹנָה לְשֵׁם אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלְשֵׁם כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל, שְׁנֵיהֶם לְשֵׁם כְּרָכִים הַמוֹקְפִים וְלְשֵׁם כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁית לְשֵׁם בְּבֶל וּמְדֵי וְלְשֵׁם מְדִינֹת הָרְחוֹקוֹת וְלְשֵׁם כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל.

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*]^L 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.

תַּנִּי: נִטַּל מִן הָרֵאשׁוֹנָה, אֶף עַל פִּי שֵׁישׁ בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה – נִטַּל מִן הַשְּׁנֵי, נִטַּל מִן הַשְּׁנֵיהֶם אֶף עַל פִּי שֵׁישׁ בְּשְׁנֵיהֶם – נִטַּל מִן הַשְּׁלִישִׁית.

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^N labeled with a *beit*. 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 *gimmel*.

שְׁלֵמָה שְׁלִישִׁית – חוּזַר לְשְׁנֵיהֶם, שְׁלֵמָה שְׁנֵיהֶם – חוּזַר לְרֵאשׁוֹנָה. שְׁלֵמוֹ שְׁלֹשֶׁת – חוּזַר וְשׂוֹקֵל.

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,^H 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.

רַבִּי מֵאִיר אָמַר: חוּזַר לְשִׁירִים. שְׁהִיא רַבִּי מֵאִיר אָמַר: מוֹעֲלִים בְּשִׁירִים, שְׂמָא יַעֲטְרוּ לָהֶן בְּסוּף.

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,^N 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.

NOTES

Take on the status of the remainder of the chamber – נַעֲשׂוּ כּוֹלֵן שִׁירִים: 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 – הִיא הֵיטָה עֲשִׂירָה שְׁבַבְלוֹן: 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 (*daf 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 (*Tiklin Hadatin*).

Although shekels remain in the first basket, shekels are taken from the second basket – אֶף עַל פִּי שֵׁישׁ בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה נִטַּל: 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 would have a part in the communal offerings (*Rabbeinu Meshulam; Tiklin Hadatin*).

The *halakhot* of misusing consecrated property apply to the

leftover shekels – מוֹעֲלִים בְּשִׁירִים: 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.

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Pinehas ben Yair – רבי פנחס בן יאיר: A Sage of the Mishna, Rabbi Pinehas ben Yair was recognized as a miracle worker and one of the most righteous men of all generations.

Rabbi Pinehas was a contemporary of Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai. 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 Pinehas ben Yair's donkey would refuse to eat of grain that had not been tithed (see 13b).

Few of Rabbi Pinehas' 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.

HALAKHA

Cleanliness leads to purity – נקיות מביאה לידי טהרה: 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 perushim, 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 Pinehas ben Yair in the Jerusalem Talmud (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalim 17:12, and the comment of the Kesef Mishne).

וכן היה רבי פנחס בן יאיר אומר: וריוות מביאה לידי נקיות, נקיות מביאה לידי טהרה, טהרה מביאה לידי קדושה, קדושה מביאה לידי ענוה.

ענוה מביאה לידי יראת חטא, יראת חטא מביאה לידי חסידות, חסידות מביאה לידי רוח הקודש, רוח הקודש מביאה לידי תחיית המתים, תחיית המתים מביאה לידי אליהו זכור לטוב.

וריוות מביאה לידי נקיות – דכתיב: 'ובלילה מכפר'. נקיות מביאה לידי טהרה – דכתיב: 'וכפר עליה הפהן וטהרה'.

Since the previous mishna deals with the obligation to be guiltless even in the eyes of men and this mishna speaks of the alacrity displayed by the members of the house of Rabban Gamliel when they gave their shekels, the Gemara brings a baraita dealing with worthy traits, including the trait of alacrity: **And so Rabbi Pinehas ben Yair^p would say:ⁿ Alacrity in the proper performance of the mitzvot leads to cleanlinessⁿ of the soul, so that one will not sin. Cleanliness of the soul and refraining from all sin leads to purity,^{hn} so that one purifies his soul from his previous sins. Purity leads to holiness. Holiness leads to humility, as one recognizes his lowliness.**

Humility leads to fear of sin,ⁿ because 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,ⁿ 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 adduces 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).** "And when 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 that 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.

NOTES

וכן היה רבי פנחס – רבי פנחס בן יאיר אומר: Different versions of this homily, attributed to Rabbi Pinehas ben Yair, appear in a number of places in the Talmud (see Avoda Zara 20b and Mishna Sota 9:15, where this baraita has been appended to the mishna). In other versions, the teaching begins with the statement that Torah study leads to zehirut, 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 – נקיות: This means cleanliness from all iniquity (Rashi on Avoda Zara 20b) and from all evil thoughts (Ra'a; Ri'az). Rabbi Ya'akov 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 – טהרה: 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 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, Orah Hayyim 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.

ענוה מביאה לידי יראת חטא: A humble person does not regard himself as a perfect human being who will not sin; rather, he is fearful and flees from iniquity. Alternatively, since he does not ascribe importance to himself, and what is truly important to him is the will and honor of God, he fears doing anything that runs counter to God's will. This in turn brings him to the level of piety, where his world is comprised exclusively of divine matters. He may then become God's chariot, and the Holy spirit rests upon him from on High (see Maharashdam, Orah Hayyim 17; Mesillat Yesharim).

מביאה לידי תחיית המתים: This means that he will merit to resurrect the dead through his prayers, as did the prophets, the righteous, and the Sages of the Mishna (Nimmukei Yosef). The Maharashdam explains that this also means he will cause others to repent, as the wicked are considered as if they were dead. He, in turn, resurrects their souls. This is in keeping with the Sages' statement: Any person who has the fear of Heaven, his words are heeded (Berakhot 6b).

טְהַרָה מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי קְדוּשָׁה – דְּכַתִּיב: 'וְטָהַרוּ וְקִדְּשׁוּ'. קְדוּשָׁה מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי עֲנָוָה – דְּכַתִּיב: 'כִּי כֹה אָמַר רַם וְנִשְׂאָ שׁוֹכֵן עַד וְקִדּוּשׁ שְׁמוֹ מְרוֹם וְקִדּוּשׁ אֲשֶׁבוֹן וְאֵת דְּכָא וְשִׁפְלָ רֹחַ'.

עֲנָוָה מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי יִרְאַת חֲטָא – דְּכַתִּיב: 'עֵקֶב עֲנָוָה יִרְאַת ה'". יִרְאַת חֲטָא מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי חֲסִידוּת – דְּכַתִּיב: 'וְחֻסְדִּי ה' מֵעוֹלָם וְעַד עוֹלָם עַל יִרְאַו'.

חֲסִידוּת מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי רוּחַ הַקְּדוֹשׁ – דְּכַתִּיב: 'אִזְ דְּבִרְתָּ בְּחֻזֵּן לְחֲסִידֵיךְ'. רוּחַ הַקְּדוֹשׁ מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי תַחֲנוּנֵי הַמֵּתִים – דְּכַתִּיב: 'וְנָתַתִּי רוּחִי בְכֶם וְחַיִּיתֶם'. תַחֲנוּנֵי הַמֵּתִים מִבִּיאָה לְיָדֵי אֱלֹהֵי זְכוּר לְטוֹב – דְּכַתִּיב: 'הִנֵּה אֲנִכִּי שׁוֹלַח לְכֶם אֵת אֱלֹהֵי הַנְּבִיאִי לְפָנַי בְּאֵ יוֹם ה' הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא'.

תָּנָא בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי מֵאִיר: כָּל מִי שֶׁקְּבוֹעַ בְּאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל, וּמְדַבֵּר בְּלִשׁוֹן הַקְּדוֹשׁ, וְאוֹכֵל פִּירוֹתָיו בְּטַהֲרָה, וְקוֹרֵא קְרִיאַת שְׁמַע בְּבוֹקֵר וּבְעֶרֶב – יֵהָא מְבוֹשֵׁר שְׁבֵן עוֹלָם הַבָּא הוּא.

הדרון עלך פרק בשלשה פרקים

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 16:19), 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 [hasidut], 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.

הלכה א מתני' התרומה מה היה עושין בה? לוקחין בה תמידין ומוספין ונספיהם, העומר ושתי לחם ולחם הפנים, וכל קרבנות הציבור.

שומרי ספיחין בשביעית נוטלין שכרן מתרומת הלשכה. רבי יוסי אומר: אף הרוצה מתנדב שומר חנם. אומר לו: אף אתה אומר שאין באין אלא

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?**^H 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^N meal-offering; and wheat for both the two loaves^N offered on Shavuot and the shewbread;^N and animals for all the communal offerings.^N

S The guards of the *sefihin*, grain that grew without being purposely planted, during the Sabbatical Year,^H 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.^H 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

HALAKHA

The collection of half-shekels, what would they do with it – התרומה מה היה עושין בה: What did they do with the half-shekels collected from the chamber on behalf of the Temple treasury? They purchased the animals for the daily offerings, the additional offerings, and all other communal offerings, as well as the wine for their libations and the salt with 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 heifer, 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* 4:1).

The guards of the *sefihin* during the Sabbatical Year – שומרי

ספיחין בשביעית: During the Sabbatical Year, when all produce that grows in the fields is ownerless, the courts hire watchmen to guard some of the wheat and barley in order to be able to offer the omer and the two loaves, which were made from the new crop of grain grown in Eretz Yisrael (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Shekalim* 4:5).

Guards of the *sefihin*...collect their wages from the collection of the Temple treasury chamber – שומרי ספיחין...: They would not allow anyone to volunteer his services to guard the *sefihin*, 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).

NOTES

The omer – העומר: 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 – שתי לחם: 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 – לחם הפנים: 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 happanim*, is derived from the word *panim*, which can refer to walls or corners. It is a reference to the unusual shape of the bread (*Menakhot* 96a; see Rashi there). Alternatively, its name is derived from the word *penim* inside, as the shewbread was placed inside the Sanctuary (*HaKetav VeHakabbala*). It is also known as the *lehem hatamid*, the continuous bread, as it was in the Sanctuary continuously.

And all the communal offerings – וכל קרבנות הציבור: 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'irin*).