

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Taking bribes (cont.)

The Gemara concludes recounting an incident related to accepting bribes.

The Gemara revisits a reference made to Elisha on the previous daf and elaborates on the number of students that remained behind after a group would leave.

### 2) Payment from the Beis Hamikdash treasury

Different Amoraim identify different professionals who receive their wages from the Beis Hamikdash treasury.

R' Nachman and Rav disagree whether the women who weave the curtains for the Beis Hamikdash take their wages from the Beis Hamikdash treasury.

R' Nachman's view that the women weavers were paid from the maintenance fund of the Beis Hamikdash is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another Baraisa lists different people paid from the Beis Hamikdash treasury.

R' Huna asked Rav whether utensils of the Beis Hamikdash (כלי שרת) were bought with money from the Beis Hamikdash treasury. The question amounts to whether they serve the altar of the קרבנות.

Rav answered that they are bought with Beis Hamikdash treasury funds.

R' Huna unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

A Baraisa is cited in support of Rav's ruling.

The proof is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another challenge to Rav's position is presented.

The Gemara defends Rav by noting that the matter is subject to a dispute amongst Tannaim recorded in a Baraisa.

The last idea mentioned in the Baraisa is explained. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The salaries of the scribes came from the communal funds*  
מגיהי ספרים שבירושלים היו נוטלין שכרן מתרומת הלשכה

What is the nature of the job of these scribes who corrected the scrolls? Rashi explains that they were paid to be available to correct the texts and scrolls of the people living in the city. The Gemara earlier (19b) taught that it is prohibited for a person to retain an uncorrected text in their house, as this may cause terrible harm to unsuspecting people who may read it and be the recipient of misinformation. Therefore, correcting texts was seen as a communal need, and these scribes were engaged to fix and maintain these scrolls. The scribes were paid with communal funds of the Beis Hamikdash so that no one would be lax in maintaining the integrity of his texts. Rashi adds that it must be that the sages deemed these funds as ownerless, using the power of הפקר בית דין הפקר, which removed their status of being consecrated funds, and they could be used to pay these scribes.

Tosafos (מעילה יד. ד"ה בונין) writes that it was permitted to use these funds from the Mikdash for the scribes, although it seems that they were consecrated, because the court determined that they should not be consecrated in the first place, knowing that this money would be necessary for the salaries of these civil servants. However, Tosafos in our Gemara seems to say that the Jewish people donated these funds for the salaries of the scribes, just as they donated the remaining funds for the animals for the offerings.

Mikdash David writes that Tosafos in מעילה and here do not necessarily disagree in regard to how these funds would be permitted to use for the scribes. There are two basic issues which have to be addressed. First of all, how do we know that the money donated for the offerings could be used for other worthy causes? Second of all, how do we release the sanctity of the money and allow it to be given to these workers?

Tosafos in our Gemara points out that the salaries of the scribes was a routine expense, and budgeting required an allowance for it. We do not need the Beis din to intercede and permit usage of the funds for this purpose, as the Jews themselves donated money expecting it to be used for this purpose. Tosafos in מעילה deals with the issue of how the designation of the money as being consecrated can be solved. In this regard, Tosafos explains that Beis din declared that the status of being הקדש did not apply in the first place. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What caused Elieyahu Hanavi to stop visiting R' Anan?  
-----
2. Which curtains were paid for out of בדיק הבית funds?  
-----
3. What fund paid for the service utensils?  
-----
4. What was done with the profits generated from the extra half-shekels?  
-----

## HALACHAH Highlight

### *Are curtains pat of a Beis Haknesses?*

אמר ר' נחמן אמר רב נשים האורגות בפרוכת נוטלות שכר מתרומת הלשכה ואני אומר מקדשי בדק הבית וכו'

*R' Nachman in the name of Rav said that women who weave the curtains collect their fee from the half-shekel fund but I maintain that they receive payment from the maintenance fund*

There was once a man who came to visit a particular town and donated a sum of money for the Beis Haknesses. He specified that the money should be used for "the needs of the Beis Haknesses." The treasurer inquired whether it was permissible to use those funds for the curtains that cover the aron kodesh. He suggested that since the doors are attached to the wall and the curtains cover those doors it should be considered part of the structure of the Beis Haknesses and this it is permissible to use the donated funds for that purpose. Another related inquiry pertained to a curtain used to separate the men's section of the Beis Haknesses from the women's section. Since there was a need to have a curtain separating these sections, could that be considered part of the "needs of the Beis Haknesses" or do we assume that the benefactor only intended the actual structure?

Rav Yosef Chaim of Baghdad<sup>1</sup>, the Ben Ish Chai, responded that this inquiry could be resolved from our Ge-

mara. The Gemara presents a dispute between Rav and R' Nachman whether the cost of manufacturing the curtains of the Beis Hamikdash was paid from the half-shekel fund (תרומת הלשכה) or from the maintenance fund (בדק הבית). A Baraisa ruled explicitly like Rav that the cost of the curtains is paid from the half-shekel fund, and R' Nachman responded that the Baraisa referred to a different category of curtains. Rashi<sup>2</sup> explains that curtains were placed in the entrances for privacy purposes (לצניעותא) and were not considered part of the structure of the Beis Hamikdash and the cost of those curtains came from the half-shekel fund. Other curtains were to replace walls that were not present, i.e. the curtains that replaced the wall separating the kodoshim from the heichal, and those curtains that replaced walls were paid for out of the maintenance fund since they are considered part of the structure of the Beis Hamikdash. We thus see that curtains that replace walls are part of the structure, but those that are in place to provide privacy are not considered part of the structure. Thus, the benefactor's funds may be used for the curtain to separate the men's section from the women's section since that replaces a wall, but the curtains used to cover the aron kodesh are for privacy and thus the benefactor's funds may not be used for that purpose. ■

1. שו"ת תורה לשמה סי' ל"ז.

2. רש"י ד"ה בדבבי. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### *The Dust of Rising*

"...הוה סליק אבקא וכסי ליה ליומא..."

The Beis Avraham, zt"l, was once approached and asked why arrogance is the worst spiritual blemish. He responded, "When one transgresses a different sin, the more one learns and ascends spiritually, the more one feels a need to repent since sin is an innate contradiction to reaching higher spiritual levels. Arrogance is different because it feeds on one's achievements. So the more one learns, davens, or does mitzvos, the bigger one feels. This means that one is not more likely to

do teshuvah at all. On the contrary, one will most likely feel even more worthy of honor and esteem."

The only release from the trap of Torah and mitzvos adding to one's swollen head is to stop thinking about oneself. Instead, one should make an effort to learn and daven for its own sake.

The Kotzker Rebbe, zt"l, was a chassid of the famous Yehudi of Peshischa before he ascended to greatness in his own right. He was most often in Peshischa, but would periodically make short visits to his home in Tomashov.

During one such visit, he entered the Beis Medrash and heard a young scholar by the name of Tzvi Hirsch

learning the Gemara in Kesuvos 106a which states that when the students got up after the lecture of Rav Huna, the dust from their coats would cover up the light of day.

The Kotzker approached the young man and asked, "What does that mean? Could they really have covered the light of the sun with the dust of their rising?"

The young man thought a moment and said, "I don't know what it really means. Do you?"

"It means they were shocked and dismayed by the amount of spiritual dirt which could accumulate and cling to the rabbinical robe of the students! There is only way to cleanse this filth—by learning Torah לשמה!" ■

