



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shekalim Daf Hey

PEREK MITZARFIN SHEKALIM -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA – HALACHA ALEPH

- After people gave their machtzis hashekkel to the local collector, the collector may then exchange the coins for golden coins ("darkonos"), which are more valuable, which thereby lessen the amount of coins that need to be carried to Yerushalayim.
- Just like there were boxes for deposit of the shekalim in the Beis Hamikdash, there were similar boxes set up in all communities.
- If the money was stolen from, or lost by, the messenger who was carrying for the community to Yerushalayim: if the money was stolen after the new shekalim had already started to be used in the Beis Hamikdash (when the new money is used, all people have a share in it, whether or not their money had reached the Bes Hamikdash), then the money is considered to belong to hekesh and the messenger must swear to the one in charge of hekesh (and he will then be patur from having to pay). If the money was stolen or lost before that time, he must swear to the people of the community (and will then be patur from having to pay), and they must then give new money to be sent to Yerushalayim. If the coins are later returned or found, they are brought up to Yerushalayim with the status of machtzis hashekkel as well, but they are not credited to the people of the community for the obligation of this year or any future year.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why doesn't the messenger change the shekalim into pearls, which are more valuable and thus easier to carry!? **A:** We are concerned that the price of pearls will decline, which will cause a loss to hekesh.
- Only boxes for the collection of "new shekalim" were placed in the communities. However, a box for "old shekalim" (shekalim that one still owes but has not yet paid by the time Tishrei rolled around) was only placed in the Beis Hamikdash.
- When the Mishna says that the messenger swears and is then patur from having to pay, that is only true if the messenger is a shomer chinam (he is not paid for his services). If he is a shomer sachar (a paid messenger), he would be chayuv to pay for theft and lost items. **R' Abba** said, the Mishna may be referring to a shomer sachar, and could be referring to where the money was stolen by armed robbers, or lost on a sinking ship. Those cases are considered to be an "oneis", from which even a shomer sachar is patur to pay.
- **R' Yusti bar R' Simon** said, our Mishna that says that once the new shekalim had already started to be used in the Beis Hamikdash, the messenger must swear to hekesh, follows the shitah that says that when money is separated, it is separated on behalf of the people who have already contributed and on behalf of the people who have yet to contribute, but who will do so.

BNEI HA'IHR SHESHALCHU ES SHIKLEIHEM...

- **R' Elazar** said, although we typically do not swear on property of hekesh, our Mishna follows **R' Shimon**, who says that if someone will be responsible for the lost asset (like in the Mishna, where the people will have to give machtzis hashekkel again), we do swear. **R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna can follow all shitos. This "swearing" that we make him do was instituted by the **Rabanan**.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** it makes sense why at times he swears to hekesh and at times to the community (it is a Rabbinic institution). However, according to **R' Elazar**, he

swears to the community as per **R' Shimon**, but why would he ever swear to hekesh!?

A: The messengers never swear regarding the money. The Mishna is discussing where the messenger is swearing to collect his fee from the community. The Mishna says, if the theft or loss happens when it already belongs to hekesh, that oath must be taken in the presence of hekesh, so that hekesh does not suspect the messenger of having stolen the money or acted negligently regarding the money.

- According to **R' Yochanan**, even if the community agrees to reimburse hekesh for the loss without demanding an oath from the messenger, still the **Rabanan** enacted that the messenger must swear, so that money of hekesh is not treated lightly.
- **R' Yochanan** says, if one separated a shekel to be used, and then lost it, he must give another one to hekesh, because it is not considered as given to hekesh until it reaches hekesh. **Reish Lakish** says he would not be responsible to reimburse hekesh, because as soon as it is separated as hekesh, it is considered to be in hekesh's possession, no matter where it is.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says that the people of the community must give shekalim again, not like **Reish Lakish** said!? **A:** This is also an enactment of the **Rabanan** so that money of hekesh not be treated lightly.
- The Mishna said that if the original shekalim are found, both sets of shekalim must be given to hekesh. What is done with each set? A Braisa says, the first set is put with the "new shekalim" fund, and the second set is put with the "old shekalim" fund.
 - **R' Pinchas the son of R' Chiya** and **R' Abba Mari** argue: one says the stolen set is called the "first set", and the other says that the other set is called the "first set".

MISHNA – HALACHA BEIS

- If Reuven gives his shekel to Shimon to give to hekesh for him, and Shimon then goes and gives it for his own shekel obligation, if hekesh had already begun to use the new shekalim, Shimon is considered to have committed "me'ilah" from hekesh.
- If one gives his shekel from money that was already hekesh, when hekesh begins to use the new money and offers an animal purchased with that money, for a korbon, he then commits me'ilah.
- If one gave his shekel from ma'aser sheini money or "shmitta money" (money earned from selling shmitta produce), he must use an equal amount of money to purchase food, and eat it.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna's second case says that he commits me'ilah when an animal is offered from the new shekalim. However, a Braisa says that he commits me'ilah as soon as the new shekalim are used!? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Shimon**, who says that when hekesh pays for the animal, the money belongs to the seller immediately (which is why the one who gave the money would commit me'ilah at that time). Our Mishna says the seller does not acquire the money until the animal is used (which is why the one who gave the money would commit me'ilah at that time).
- **Q:** In the Mishna's first case, when Shimon gives the shekel, why don't we just consider it as given for Reuven (money is fungible and should therefore be credited to the proper person, irrespective of who actually handed it in)?? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the coin was clearly identifiable and is therefore used by hekesh as having been given by Shimon.
 - **Q:** It is possible that the shekel given by Shimon was not actually used, and was left over after all that was needed was used (in which case it is used for the upkeep of Yerushalayim). If so, how can we definitively say that he committed me'ilah (unless we follow the minority view of **R' Meir**, who says that one commits me'ilah by using the money from the leftovers as well)!? **A:** As we said earlier, we are discussing an identifiable coin which was placed down in front of the person of hekesh as he was going to take money to buy korbanos. Therefore, it will surely be used for the korbanos.
 - **Q:** One must benefit from hekesh in order to commit me'ilah. What benefit does this person get? **A:** **R' Avin** said, since his assets will not be seized by Beis Din (because he gave the shekel), he is considered to have benefitted.

MI'MA'ASER SHEINI...

- He must remove the kedusha of the ma'aser from the coin to allow the kedusha of machtzis hashekkel to set in. We learn this from a bechor animal, which the pasuk teaches cannot be made hekdesch, since it is already kadosh on its own.
- The person must declare that the kedushas ma'aser should go onto other coins. These new coins become ma'aser, and the old coins then get the kedusha of machtzis hashekkel.