

שבת קודש פרשת כי תבוא | מסכת כתובות דף ק"ו

INSIGHTS FROM OUR CHABUROS | **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 *דין הפקר*, which removed their status of being consecrated funds, and they could be used to pay these scribes.

Tosafos (בנין) 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 Eliyahu HaNavi to stop visiting R' Annan?
2. Which curtains were paid for out of *בית* funds?
3. What fund paid for the service utensils?
4. What was done with the profits generated from the extra half-shekels?

STORIES OF THE DAF | **The Dust of Rising**

"...הוה סליק אבקא וכסי ליה ליומא..."

The Beis Avraham, zt"l, was once 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*"

HALACHA HIGHLIGHT

Are curtains part of a Beis Haknesses?

אמר ר' נחמן אמר רב נשים האורגות בפרוכת נוטלות
שכרן 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 Baghdad¹, the Ben Ish Chai, responded that this inquiry could be resolved from our Gemara. 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) (השלכה) 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. Rashi² 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 kodesh 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. שר"ת תורה לשמה סי' ל"ז.
2. רש"י ד"ה בדבבי.

PARSHA CONNECTION

In this week's daf the גמרא discusses various parties who get paid from "תרומת הלשכה". The word תרומה is also associated with תרומת ידך אלו (ביכורים) (The גמרא דף ע"ג) (ביכורים) which is the first subject of this week's פרשה. There is a perplexing aspect to the תרומת הביכורים described in the פסוקים in the פרשה, as follows: The Possuk (דברים פרק כו פסוק ד) says: ביכורים. ולקח הכהן הטנא מידך והניחו לפני מזבח ה' אלקיך. (like it says לקח הכהן הטנא מידך) (את הטנא מידך) which takes place as soon as the ישראל bringing the עזרה. Yet in Possuk Yud after the ישראל says the פרשה of הגדת היום the Torah quotes the Yisroel as saying: ועתה הנה הבאתי את-ראשית פרי האדמה אשר-נתתה לי ה' והנחתו לפני ה' אלקיך והשתחוית לפני ה' אלקיך. How can the ישראל put down the basket after it was already put down earlier by the כהן when he walked into the בית המקדש? The answer is that after the כהן puts it down, the ישראל picks it up again and reads the פרשה like רש"י explains in the name of the ספרי. But why do it this way? Why put it down only to pick it up and put it down again? The אלשיך הקדוש offers a beautiful insight into this process. When he first comes in, the ישראל is all proud that he just completed the trip and offering the first fruits to the כהן. The כהן puts it down by the מזבח to remind him, that it's not HIS fruit that he just brought, but rather it belongs to the ריבונו של עולם, who gave him the fruit in the first place. Once that message "registers" he is in the right frame of mind to truly express his appreciation, which is the essence of ביכורים. Let's always remember that everything we have is a gift from the ריבונו של עולם!

POINT TO PONDER

The Gemara says רב נחמן took the case of the fellow sent to him by רב ענן before taking the case of the תומים. The גמרא says that רב ענן was wrong in this story and אליהו stopped coming to him as a result. However, it seems like רב נחמן isn't blamed for his actions. If prioritizing a חכם תלמיד will cause the other side to get confused and lose his claims, how come רב נחמן wasn't concerned about this possibility?

Response to last week's Point to Ponder:

The Gemara (according to רש"י) writes that if a בהמה destroys someone's sapling the שבירושלים said that if it's one year old he pays כסף שני etc. Why did the גמרא cite this example? Isn't this a regular case of מזיק that should be treated like any instance of damage caused by one's animal?

A העיט is a unique item because it is not a tree that has value due to its fruit, or due to its wood (lumber). Therefore the גמרא assigned a "fine" to protect saplings planted in ארץ ישראל. (See מקובצת).