



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### **Mishna**

Both valid sacrifices and invalid sacrifices, but those that rendered unfit in the Holy (*those mentioned above in a Mishna – that become invalidated after entering the Courtyard, which once placed on the altar, are not taken down*), if one offered them up outside, he is liable. He who offers up an olive’s volume of an *olah* offering and of the sacrificial parts outside, is liable. (109a)

### **Scriptural Sources**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, which cites the Scriptural sources for the ruling of the *Mishna*:

*Any man . . . who will offer up an olah* – one who offers up an *olah* outside is liable.

*A sacrifice* - one who offers up the sacrificial parts of an *asham*, *chatas*, or other *kodshei kodashim*, or *kodashim kalim* outside is liable.

*And to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting he will not bring it* – one who offers up a *komeitz* (*fistful of flour separated from a minchah offering*), *levonah* (*frankincense*), incense, the *minchah* offering of *Kohanim*, the *minchah* offering of the anointed *Kohen*, and one who pours three *logs* of wine or of water outside, is liable, for whatever comes to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting, one is liable on its account.

*He will not bring it to render it* – one who offers up outside any of the following invalid offerings is liable: an offering which stayed overnight, or one which went out beyond the Courtyard, or one that became *tamei*, or one which was slaughtered with a “beyond its time” or “outside of its place” intent, or one whose blood was received or sprinkled by disqualified people, or one whose blood was applied below when it should have been applied above, or above when it

should have been applied below, or outside the *Heichal* when it should have been applied inside, or inside when it should have been applied outside, or a *pesach* offering or a *chatas* which was slaughtered not for their own sake. One is liable on account of these, for they are accepted at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting. (109a)

### **Combinations**

The *Mishna* had stated: He who offers up an olive’s volume of an *olah* offering and of the sacrificial parts outside, is liable.

The *Gemora* infers from here that one will not be liable for offering up outside a *shelamim* and its sacrificial parts. [*This is so because the meat of the shelamim is not fit to be burned on the altar at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting.*]

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* with a similar inference: An *olah* offering and its sacrificial parts combine towards an olive’s volume, in respect of offering them up outside, and in respect of being liable through them on account of *piggul*, *nossar*, and *tamei*. [*The inference is that this is not the halachah with respect of a shelamim offering.*]

The *Gemora* asks: The *halachah* stated in the *braisa* and the inference implied from it is understandable regarding offering outside, for the *olah* offering is completely burned (*and therefore its meat and sacrificial parts combine to a k’zayis*) and a *shelamim* is not (*and therefore its meat and sacrificial parts do not combine*); however, what is the reason for *piggul*, *nossar*, and *tamei*? Surely it was taught in a *Mishna*: All foods that are *piggul* combine, and all foods that

are *nossar* combine!? The rulings on *piggul* and *nossar* are contradictory!?

The *Gemora* answers: The rulings on *piggul* are not contradictory, for the *Mishna* is referring to a case where one is eating *piggul* (and therefore the meat and sacrificial parts combine), whereas the *braisa* is referring to the intention of *piggul* (and by an *olah*, where everything is burned on the altar, the meat and the sacrificial parts combine; however, by a *shelamim*, the intention to eat the meat and the intention to burn the sacrificial parts do not combine to render the sacrifice *piggul*). Nor are the rulings on *nossar* contradictory, for the *Mishna* is referring to a case where one is eating *nossar* (and therefore the meat and sacrificial parts combine), whereas the *braisa* is referring to a case where they (the meat and the sacrificial parts) were left over before the blood was sprinkled. [In the case of ordinary *nossar* the meat and the sacrificial parts, even of a *shelamim*, combine. It is different, however, in the following case: The entire animal, except half a *k'zayis* of the meat and the same of the sacrificial parts, was lost or destroyed before the sprinkling of the blood. Now, if this happened by an *olah*, we would have as much as a *k'zayis* for burning on the altar, and therefore the sprinkling is valid to render it *nossar*, in the sense that if it was left over until after its time and then eaten, one would be liable. In the case of a *shelamim*, however, there is only half a *k'zayis* for the burning on the altar and the same for human consumption. These do not combine to permit the sprinkling. If one did sprinkle, therefore, the sprinkling is not valid to render it *nossar*. The same applies to *tumah*.]

And who is the *Tanna* of this *braisa*? It is Rabbi Yehoshua, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehoshua said: All the sacrifices of the Torah (which was lost or destroyed) of which as an olive's volume of meat or an olive's volume of *cheilev* (sacrificial parts) remains, he sprinkles the blood. If there remains half an olive's volume of meat and half an olive's volume of *cheilev*, he may not sprinkle the blood. But in the case of an *olah*, even if there remains half an olive's volume of meat and half an olive's volume of *cheilev*, he sprinkles the

blood, because it is completely burned. By a *minchah* offering, however, even if is completely in existence, he must not sprinkle the blood.

Rav Pappa explains that the *minchah* case refers to the libation *minchah* which accompanies an animal sacrifice. (109a – 109b)

### **Mishna**

With regard to the *kometz*, the *levonah*, the incense, the *minchah* of *Kohanim*, the *minchah* of the anointed *Kohen*, and the libation *minchah* offering, if one offered up as much as an olive's volume of one of these outside the Temple, he is liable. But Rabbi Eliezer exempts him unless he offers them up in their entirety. [Rabbi Eliezer holds that he is not liable, since it was done with a portion of the *mattir* only, for it is not regarded as a service unless he completes the entire service.] If one offered any of these inside, but left over an olive's volume of it and offered it up outside, he is liable. And if any was diminished, even a little, and he offered it up outside, he is exempt. If one offers the meat of sacrificial animals and their sacrificial parts outside, he is liable. (109b)

### **Burning Incense Outside**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If one burns an olive's volume of *ketores* outside, he is liable; if one burns half a *peras* inside, he is not liable.

The *Gemora* asks: If it means than a non-*Kohen* who burns it is not liable, what would be the reason for that? Surely it is a burning (as is evident from the first ruling of the *braisa*)!?

Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rav Chisda in the name of Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba in the name of Rav: Not liable means that the community is not liable to bring more (if the *Kohen* merely burned half of a *peras*).

Rabbi Zeira asked: But my difficulty is in that which Rav said that even Rabbi Elozar would agree to this; but surely Rabbi Elozar maintains that this does not constitute a burning (for



he, in the Mishna, exempts him unless he offers them up in their entirety)!!?

Rabbah answers: In respect of burning in the *Heichal* there is no disagreement. [All agree that the daily burning in the *Heichal* is fulfilled with as much as an olive's volume, because the Torah does not prescribe a quantity for this; and the amount of a *peras* is merely Rabbinic. Consequently Rabbi Elozar admits that if one burns an olive's volume outside, he is liable. And for the same reason, the community has discharged its obligation when an olive's volume is burned inside.] They disagree with respect of the burning inside (on *Yom Kippur*). Rabbi Elozar holds that "his two handfuls" is particularly meant (and is an absolute requirement); whereas the Sages maintain that "his two handfuls" is not particularly meant.

Abaye asked him that when the Torah wrote "statute," it was written in reference to the burning inside (which means that it's an absolute requirement)!!?

Rather, Abaye said: They do not disagree regarding the burning inside (on *Yom Kippur*); they disagree only with respect of the burning outside (of the *Yom Kippur* incense). The Sages hold that we derive the inside from the outside. [Just as one is liable for burning an olive's volume of the daily incense outside, so too is one liable for burning an olive's volume of the *Yom Kippur* incense outside (although that same quantity burned inside - in its rightful place, is not regarded as burning).] Rabbi Elozar, however, holds that we do not derive the inside from the outside (and he is therefore not liable for burning this amount outside on *Yom Kippur*).

Rava asked: Seeing that the Sages do not derive outside from outside, can there be any question that they do not derive inside from outside?

Rather, Rava said: The case of the *Mishna* applies where they placed two measures of half a *peras* into a vessel; Rabbi Elozar considers the placing into the vessel as a significant

matter (and therefore one will not be liable unless he burns both measures outside); whereas the Sages do not consider it significant. (109b – 110a)

#### DAILY MASHAL

Those who daven Nusach Ashkenaz, begin Pesukei d'Zimrah with Mizmor Shir Chanukas, while in Nusach Ari and Nusach Sfarad, the custom is to begin with Hodu. In either case, Mizmor Shir is recited prior to Baruch She'amar, as a fitting introduction to Pesukei d'Zimra. One of the great Chassidic Rebbes noted that while Nusach Sfarad and Ashkenaz begin their Tefillah from divergent points of entry, when it comes to Yehi Kavod Hashem, "Let it be the Glory of Hashem," they meet at the same focal point. For our purposes, we will begin with an explanation of Mizmor Shir. The Arizal included Mizmor Shir in his Siddur, and over time it found its way into the other Siddurim. He revealed some of the secrets of this Psalm, such as that Hashem's Name is mentioned ten times, corresponding with the Aseres HaDibros, Ten-Commandments.

David HaMelech refers to the Bais HaMikdash as the House of David. Why? Did he build it? Shlomo, his son, built it. The Midrash explains that David was moser nefesh, devoted himself to the point of self-sacrifice, to see it built. Therefore, it is attributed to him. His willingness to give up everything earned him the merit that the Bais HaMikdash is called by his name. Indeed, he prepared everything for it. He left nothing undone - he even composed the song of Inauguration.

This song is primarily a song of gratitude. Horav Avigdor Miller, zl, explains that this indicates that the primary function of the Bais HaMikdash was to give thanks to Hashem. Everything that occurred there was done solely to demonstrate our gratitude to Hashem. This is the true meaning of avodah, service: Thank you, Hashem.

By: Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum