

ADDENDUM TO SHEKALIM 22

מסכת שקלים - פרק שמיני

לג:

עין משפט

א. ומכאן פסוק פ"ו
הע"י

סמל

מיתות

הראשונים

[א] שם יבנה הבית

כבראשונה וכו'.

וכשיגיע אחד בניסן

צריך להביא תרומה

חדשה, ומצא

ששקלים של זה לא

חלה עליהן קדושה,

שהרי צריך להביא

אחרים, ואע"ג

דאמרינן לעיל פ"ב ו)

ע"כ נמצאו אר

שהחזירים הגנבים

אילו ואילו שקלים

הם, התם לפי

שהופרשו בזמנו

באור, אבל הכא דלא

הופרשו בזמנו לא.

[מלמד]

[ב] הלכה כרבי

בניסן והמעות שתרם יהיו מן הישנה ולא ישתמשו בהם
לקרבנות וקרא בגר מה אית לך לחשוש הרי אפשר
להביא את קרבנו גם מתרומה ישנה?

רב אדא ורב המנונא רב אדא בר אבהו בשם רב
אבהו הלכה כרבי שמעון דמתניתין דביכורים אפילו בדיעבר
לא קדשו לפי שאין אדם מקדיש דבר שאינו שלו אא"כ
הקדישן הכהן לבדק הבית לאחר שבאו לידו דשלו הם:

הדרן עלך כל הרוקין

וסליקא לה מסכתא דשקלים

[בשקלים] אין מקדש, ומקשה ויניה עד שיבנה בית המקדש, ומתוך
שם יבנה הבית בראשון ותתרום תרומת הלשכה מן החדש בזמנה
באחר בניסן, והכא [בגר] מאי אית לך לחשוש הרי יכול להביא
גם מתרומה ישנה, ועל כל פנים עיקר פירושו כקרבן העדה.

3. פני משה.

אמר ליה תמן גבי שקלים לכן אין מקדישין לבתחילה
לא רק בגלל חשש תקלה אלא יש טעם אחר לפי שמוצא
להקריב מתרומה חדשה שתרמו מניסן והאיה מה שתרם
בזמן הזה הנה לה וישנה שער שיבנה המקדש עלול להיות
שתגיע שנה חדשה ולכן תיקנו חכמים שלא יחול ההקדש
כלל. ואילו הקא מאי אית לך למימר האי וישנה היא
ולכן בשקלים אין ההקדש חל כלל, אבל לגבי הקדשות
אחרים קנו של גר אינו צריך קדושה ואין כאן אלא
חשש תקלה ואם הקדיש קדוש, ומקשה הגמרא ויניח
השקלים עד שיובנה בית המקדש ואז ישתמש בהם
לקרבנות. ומתורצת (א) שם יבנה הבית כבראשונה בניסן
ותיתרם תרומת הלשכה מן החדשה בזמנה באחד

1. כבר תמה בתקלין חרות הקדשות אחרים מאן דבר שמיהו
הכא. (2) הפירוש בסוגיא ע"פ קרבן העדה. אמנם לכאורה יש
כאן קצת כפילות, שאחר שכבר ביארו שבשקלים החשש שיהיו
תרומה ישנה, חזרו והקשו ויניח עד שיבנה, וכנראה מטעם זה
מוקד הגרסיא חלק גדול מתיבות אלו, וגירסתו אמר ליה תמן

שמעון. אינא למימר כרבי שמעון דברייחא, ואיכא למימר כרבי שמעון דאמר בכרייתא ביטלה רבן יוחנן בן זכאי מפני החקלה,
דבר אדא בר אבהו גופיה קאמר פ"ב דבריות (ט ע"א) הלכה כרבי שמעון דאמר בכרייתא ביטלה רבן יוחנן בן זכאי מפני החקלה,
וכ"כ צפירוס דעס משנ"ס.

Rav Schachter on the Haggadah 179 ff

לרצון – For GRACIOUS ACCEPTANCE.
The Emek Berachah (pp. 77-78) makes
an interesting comment that explains
the significance of this word.

The passuk in the tochechah states,
"I will make your Sanctuaries desolate" (Vayikra 26:31),
from which Rabbi Yehudah concludes
that a Beis HaKnesses is still called a
mikdash and retains its kedushah even
when it lies in a state of ruin (Megillah
28a). Rabbi Yehoshua expresses a
similar opinion regarding the sanctity
of the Beis HaMikdash: קדושה ראשונה – "The
original sanctification [of Yerushalayim
and the Beis HaMikdash] sanctified
these areas for that time and sanctified

them for all future time." Thus, מקריבין
– "we may offer korba-
nos [at the Beis HaMikdash site] even
though there is no [Sanctuary] build-
ing" (Eduyos 8:6).

This point explains an enigmatic
story recorded in the Gemara in Pesachim
(3b). The Gemara recounts that there
was a certain non-Jewish Aramean who
would go up to Yerushalayim and re-
ceive a portion of Korban Pesach under
the pretense that he was Jewish. Rav
Yehudah ben Beseira convinced the
Aramean that if the other members of
his group did not give him the fatty tail
of the korban, they were not giving him
the choicest portion. In this way, Rav
Yehudah hoped to trick the Aramean

into asking for the fatty tail so that his deception would be discovered.

On his next trip to Yerushalayim, the Aramean indeed requested the fatty tail in the name of Rav Yehudah. Realizing that Rav Yehudah would never have suggested this portion, as it was among the parts of the *korban* that are burned on the *mizbei'ach*, the Jews in Yerushalayim conducted an investigation that uncovered the non-Jew's true lineage, and he was thereafter executed. They then sent a message to Rav Yehudah: "Peace to you, Rav Yehudah ben Beseira. For you are in Netzivin, but your net is spread in Yerushalayim!"

The *meforshim* ask a number of questions regarding this incident. It is forbidden for a Jew to give a portion of *Korban Pesach* to a non-Jew to eat, but the non-Jew is under no obligation to refrain from eating from the *Korban Pesach*. Why, then, did the Aramean deserve death? In addition, *Tosfos* (s.v. *mei'alyah*) raises the question of why Rav Yehudah himself did not engage in *aliyah l'regel* and offer his own *Korban Pesach*, at which time he could have informed the Jews in Yerushalayim of the Aramean's true identity. [One of *Tosfos'*

answers is that Rav Yehudah was elderly and could not ascend the Har HaBayis, and he was therefore excused from this obligation.] Finally, Rav Yehudah ben Beseira lived after the *churban haBayis*; how could the *Korban Pesach* have been offered in his days?

[The *Maharatz Chayes* (*Kol Sifrei Maharatz Chayes II, Kuntres Avodas HaMikdash*, 76:3) explains that, in fact, this incident took place after churban haBayis, and he proves from numerous sources that many *Tanna'im* offered the *Korban Pesach* after the destruction of the *Beis HaMikdash*. It was permissible to do so based on the principle mentioned above, מקריבין אף על פי שאין בית. However, since it was not obligatory to offer the *Korban Pesach* at this time, this practice was limited to certain individuals, and someone for whom it would be difficult, such as Rav Yehudah, would not participate.

Those who brought the *Korban Pesach* at this time had to do so in secrecy, as the Roman authorities would be suspicious of gatherings as possibly leading to rebellion. The Aramean who impersonated a Jew would be able to inform against those who brought the

Pesach. When his true identity was discovered, he was killed not because of any violation, but as a *rodef* (pursuer). The Jews feared that he would report them to the Roman authorities.

How did the *Tanna'im* derive from the *passuk*, וְהַשִּׁמְתִּי אֶת מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם, that the area of the *Beis HaMikdash* is permanently endowed with *kedushah*? The simple understanding of the exposition is that it is based on the sequence found in the *passuk*. The verb, "I will make desolate," is followed by the direct object, "your *Mikdashos*." This sequence implies that even after their destruction, they retain the status of "*Mikdash*."

The difficulty with this explanation is that we could have simply understood the *passuk* as foretelling that *Hashem* will make desolate the structure that had been recognized, up to that point, as the *Beis HaMikdash*, and not that the structure necessarily retains the status of "*Beis HaMikdash*" even in its state of destruction. Indeed, the *meforshim* on the *Mishnah* do not seem to feel that the arrangement of the verb and direct object in the *passuk* is particularly compelling.

The *Netziv* (*Ha'amek Davar*, *Vayikra* 26:31; *Meishiv Davar* 2:56) and the *Binyan Tziyon* (*siman* 1) offer a novel understanding of the exposition in the *Mishnah*. They write that the proof is not from the sequence, but rather from the second half of the *passuk*, וְלֹא אֲרִיחַ – "I will not savor your satisfying aromas." The difficulty that troubled the *Mishnah* is that the conclusion of the *passuk* is superfluous. If the *Beis HaMikdash* has been destroyed in terms

of both its physical structure as well as its metaphysical *kedushah*, it should be obvious that *Hashem* will not accept the aroma of *korbanos*, as *korbanos* cannot be brought in a non-sanctified location (after the period of permissibility to offer on *bamos*).

Thus, the *Mishnah* understands that this *passuk* presents a double admonition. First, the *passuk* foretells that the *Beis HaMikdash* will be destroyed. Yet, even after its destruction, the desolate *Beis HaMikdash* will retain its *kedushah*, and the *din* ought to be מִקְרִיבִין אֹף עַל פִּי שֶׁאֵין בֵּית. This is what necessitates the message of the next part of the *passuk*, which informs us that there is no purpose to offering such *korbanos*, for *Hashem* will simply not be interested in savoring the *rei'ach nicho'ach* of our *korbanos*.

[As discussed above, the *Kaftor VaFerach* (*perek* 6) writes that in 1257, Rabbeinu Yechiel MiParis, one of the *Ba'alei HaTosfos* who moved to Eretz Yisrael, advocated building a *mizbei'ach* on the *makom haMikdash* and offering *korbanos* on it. The *Netziv* interprets Rabbeinu Yechiel's plans, as well as the tradition that the *Korban Pesach* was brought after the destruction of the Second *Beis HaMikdash* until the time of the fall of Betar, in light of his explanation of the *Mishnah*.

Even though, in the *Rambam's* view (*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah* 6:14-16), the location of the *Beis HaMikdash* retained its *kedushah* after the *churban*, we are still unable to offer *korbanos* at this time, as *Hashem* told us that He is not interested in the *rei'ach nicho'ach* of our *korbanos*. However, it is most striking, continues the *Netziv*, that the *Korban*

Pesach is the one and only *korban* that the Torah never describes as providing a *rei'ach nicho'ach*. Thus, it was only the *Korban Pesach*, unique in this regard, which was offered in the post-churban period and which the *Rishonim* considered offering – not the other *korbanos*, which are brought for the purpose of providing a *rei'ach nicho'ach* to Hashem.]

[Based on this, the *Emek Berachah* explains the significance of the use of the word לרצון in the text of *Asher Ge'alanu*. This word should be understood in light of the observation of the

Netziv that the *Korban Pesach* is unique in that there is no requirement for this *korban* to provide a satisfying aroma to Hashem. Therefore, technically, we would be able to offer the *Korban Pesach* even nowadays, based on the principle מקריבין אף על פי שאין בית. In this *berachah*, we pray to Hashem that instead, we should merit the rebuilding of the *Beis HaMikdash*, so that we may then offer the type of *Korban Pesach* which will be brought לרצון, providing a *rei'ach nicho'ach* to Hashem. [See *Rav Schachter on the Parsha, Parshas Bechukosai*.]]