

18 Elul 5781
August 26, 2021



Sukkah Daf 50

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Mishnah had stated: As was its performance on weekdays etc. But why [bring the water in an unconsecrated vessel]; let him bring it in one that was consecrated?¹ — Ze’iri replied: [The author of our Mishnah] is of the opinion that no fixed amount has been prescribed for the water [of libation] and that service vessels sanctify their contents even if there was no intention. If, therefore, it were brought in a sacred vessel, it would have been rendered invalid by remaining inside of it overnight.²

Chizkiyah said: Service vessels do not in fact sanctify their contents where there was no intention, but [the use of a sacred vessel was here forbidden] as a preventive measure lest it be assumed that there was intention that the contents should be sanctified.³

Rabbi Yannai citing Rabbi Zeira said: You may even say that a fixed amount has been prescribed for the water [of libation] and that service vessels do not sanctify their contents unless there was intention, [but the use of a sacred vessel was nevertheless forbidden] as a preventive

¹ The questioner assumes that a sacred vessel does not sanctify its contents unless there is that intention, and that it does not sanctify it unless it corresponds to the specific amount prescribed for that particular service. In this case the water has neither of these conditions.

² If the water had been placed in a consecrated vessel on Friday, the water would be invalidated on account of *linah*, which means that the water becomes invalidated by remaining overnight until Shabbos morning, similar to all consecrated matter that become invalidated if it is allowed to remain until the next day.

measure lest people will think that it was filled with the water for the purpose of using it for the washing of the hands and the feet [of the Kohen Gadol]. (49b4 – 50a1)

The Mishnah had stated: If it was poured away or uncovered etc. But why?⁴ Could it not⁵ be filtered through a strainer? Must we then say that our Mishnah does not agree with Rabbi Nechemiah, for it has been taught in a Baraisa: [Liquid that has passed through] a strainer is subject to the law of uncovering. Rabbi Nechemyah, however, says that this is so only where the lower receptacle was uncovered, but if the lower receptacle was covered, it is not subject to the laws of uncovering, even though the strainer on top was uncovered, for the venom of a snake is like a sponge and remains floating in its place. - You may even maintain that it agrees with Rabbi Nechemiah, since it may be submitted that Rabbi Nechemiah's ruling referred to a regular person, but did he say thus regarding the Most High? Does Rabbi Nechemiah not uphold [the lesson of the verse]: *Bring it if you please to your officer, will he show you favor or will he turn his countenance towards you, said Hashem, Master*

³ Chizkiyah maintains that the water will only become consecrated if one intends for the sanctification to occur, but observers will assume that the one taking water from a consecrated vessel intentionally sanctified the vessels on the previous day. One observing this will erroneously assume that the water libations are not subject to the rules of *linah*.

⁴ Should uncovered water be invalid.

⁵ Since the only reason why uncovered water is forbidden is lest a snake injected its venom into it.



of Legions?" [In other words, we do not bring things to Hashem (i.e. do mitzvos) with things that are repulsive.] (50a2)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, LULAV VA'ARAVAH

CHAPTER V

MISHNAH: The flute-playing [took place] sometimes [on] five days and sometimes on six. This refers to the flute-playing at Beis Ha-sho'eivah [the Celebration of the Place of the Water-Drawing] which overrides neither the Shabbos nor the festival.⁶ (50a3)

GEMARA: It was stated: Rav Yehudah and Rav Eina differ, one of them taught Sho'eivah (the Celebration of the Place of the Water-Drawing) and the other taught Chashuvah (the Important celebration). Mar Zutra observed: He who teaches Sho'eivah is not in error, and he who teaches Chashuvah is not in error. He who teaches Sho'eivah is not in error, since it is written: And you shall draw water with rejoicing, and he who teaches Chashuvah is not in error, since Rav Nachman said: It is an important mitzvah, dating from the six days of Creation. (50b1)

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: The flute-playing overrides the Shabbos; these are the words of Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah; but the Sages ruled: It does not override even the Festival. Rav Yosef said: The dispute concerns only the song that accompanied the sacrifices, since Rabbi Yosi is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [sacrificial] song is with instruments, in consequence of which it is deemed a Temple service which overrides the Shabbos,

⁶ The Mishnah rules that the musical instruments which were used for the Simchas Bais Hashoevah could not be played on Shabbos and Yom Tov and for this reason if the first day of Sukkos occurred on Shabbos, the festivities would be for six days. If the first day of Sukkos did not occur on Shabbos, the festivities would only be for five days, as one of the intermediate days of Sukkos would be on Shabbos.

whereas the Rabbis are of the opinion that the essential feature of the [sacrificial] song is the vocal singing, in consequence of which the [playing of the instruments] is not a Temple service and does not, therefore, override the Shabbos; but with regard to the singing at the Celebration of Water-Drawing, all agree that it is a mere expression of rejoicing and does not, therefore, override the Shabbos.

From where, said Rav Yosef, do I know that the dispute concerns only that? From what has been taught in a Baraisa: If the sacred service vessels were made of wood, Rebbe rules it to be invalid, but Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah rules it to be valid. Now, do they differ on this principle, that he who declares them valid is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [sacrificial] song is with instruments and [its validity may, therefore,] be deduced from that of the reed-flute of Moshe,⁷ while he who holds them to be invalid is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [sacrificial] song is the vocal singing, and its validity, therefore, cannot be deduced from that of the reed-flute of Moshe? — No; both of them may agree that the essential feature of the [sacrificial] song is with instruments, but in this case they differ on the question whether we may deduce what it is possible [to manufacture from another material] from that which it is impossible [to manufacture from another material].⁸ He who declares them valid is of the opinion that we do deduce that which it is possible [to manufacture from another material], from that which it is impossible [to manufacture from another material], whereas he who holds them to be invalid is of the opinion that we do not deduce the possible from the impossible. And if you wish you may say that all are in agreement that the essential

⁷ Which was made of wood. Tradition dated this reed pipe employed in the Temple from Moshe. As that pipe was made of wood so may all musical instruments of the Temple be made of wood.

⁸ It was impossible to make the best of pipes of anything but reeds. All other vessels, however, can be made from metal.

feature of the [sacrificial] song is the vocal singing, and that we do not deduce the possible from the impossible, but in this case they differ on the question whether, in making the deduction concerning the Menorah⁹ we apply the principle of “generalization and a specification,” or the rule of “extension and then a limitation.” Rebbe interprets the verse using the principle of “generalization and a specification,” whereas Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah interprets it by the method of “extension and then a limitation.” He explains: Rebbe interprets the verse using the principle of “generalization and a specification,” as follows: *You shall make a Menorah* is a generalization; *from pure gold* is a specification; *beaten out shall the Menorah be made* is another generalization. It emerges that we have here a “generalization – specification - generalization” teaching, in which case you may only include such things that are similar to the item specified; and just as the material specified (*gold*) is clearly a metal, so too all metals are permitted (*but not wood*). Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah, however, interprets the verse by an “extension and then a limitation” method, as follows: *You shall make a Menorah* is an extension; *from pure gold* is a limitation; *beaten out shall the Menorah be made* is another extension. It emerges that we have here an “extension – limitation - extension” teaching, in which case they include everything. What is included? Everything. And what is excluded? Earthenware.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Cover on the Kiyor

Rabbi Dovid Meyers is the world’s authority on the precise details of the utensils that were used in the Mishkan. Rabbi Meyers related that all pictures of the kiyor, the laver, show the kiyor with a cover, but there does not appear to be a source for this. Rav Getzel Fried, Shlita,

⁹ Of the sanctuary, which is regarded as the prototype of all the other vessels.

offered a proof from our Gemara that states that if the water of the kiyor was left exposed overnight, the water cannot be used. The reason for this is because we are concerned that a snake may have drunk from the liquid in it and cast its venom in the liquid. Water that an Israelite would not drink cannot be used for the mizbeiach. It is thus evident from this Gemara that the Kiyor normally had a cover. Although it is still not known what the dimensions of the kiyor were, it certainly appears that the kiyor was covered.

DAILY MASHAL

Hashem; King of all Kings

The Gemara quotes a verse that states *when you present a blind animal for sacrifice is nothing wrong etc. present it if you please, to your governor: would he be pleased with you or show you favor? Said HaShem, Master of Legions.* We derive from this verse that just as one would not offer something inappropriate to a human king, one should not offer something inferior to HaShem. When we are engaged in prayer, which in our present situation is a substitute for sacrifices, we must be aware that we are not beseeching the mercy of a human being, who may or may not grant us our wishes without truly understanding our needs. Rather, we are entreating HaShem, the King of all kings, who knows and discerns our innermost thoughts, and has the power to grant life and prosperity. When we are cognizant of this fact, we will be able to focus more on our prayers and our service to HaShem.