

27 Mar-Cheshvan 5779
Nov. 5, 2018



Menachos Daf 87

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

Wine for libation

The *Mishna* teaches about the wine used for libation in the Bais Hamikdash. Although it could come from any vineyard, the first grade came from Keduchim and Atulin, while the second grade came from Bais Rima and Bais Lavan in the mountains, and the village of Signa in the valley.

The *Mishna* lists the status of different types of wine. Wine that was grown in a field that was fertilized, a field that needs to be watered, or a field with other vegetation in it should not be used, but is valid if used. Wine from very sweet grapes should not be used, but is valid if used. Rebbe says that one should not use old wine, while the Sages say one may. One may not use wine that is sweet, smoked, or cooked, and it is invalid if used. One should not use wine from vines that grew along a structure, but only from ones that grew on the ground and that were worked well. The wine used for libation was not gathered in large barrels, but rather in small barrels, that weren't filled to the top, in order to allow the wine's aroma to spread. The wine was not taken from the top, to avoid mold, nor from the bottom, to avoid sediment, but from the middle third. When the wine was drained from the bottom of this section, the custodian of the Bais Hamikdash supervised, with a stick in his hand. When some white started to flow out, the custodian tapped the barrel with his stick, to indicate that the flow should stop. Rabbi Yossi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says that wine with mold is invalid for libation. The *Mishna* concludes that the source for invalidating low quality materials for libations and *minchah* offerings is the verses about the sacrifices, which state:

“complete they will be for you, and their minchah”

“complete they will be for you, and their libations”

Due to the structure of these verses, they can be read to mean that the *minchah* and libations should also be “complete,” invalidating materials that have any sort of blemish. (86b – 87a)

Sweet wine?

The *Gemora* notes a seeming contradiction in the *Mishna*. The *Mishna* states that wine that is sweet, smoked, or cooked is invalid, while it stated earlier that wine from very sweet grapes is valid if used.

Ravina says that we must amend the *Mishna*, to place “wine from very sweet grapes” in the list of invalid wines.

Rav Ashi says that the case of “wine from very sweet grapes” is one where the sun made the grapes sweet, while the case of sweet wine that is invalid is one where the grapes are naturally very sweet. When they are naturally sweet, this is more inherently deficient, making it invalid. (87a)

Old wine

The *Gemora* debates the reason that Rebbe says not to use old wine. Chizkiyah says that Rebbe says not to use it, since the verse detailing libations refers to “*half a hin for the bull, a third of a hin for the ram, and a fourth of a hin for the sheep, wine...*” The end of the verse can be read as “for the sheep, wine”, teaching that just as a sheep may not be too old (more than one year), so the wine may not be old.

The *Gemora* challenges this, since this should mean that two year old wine should be invalid, just as a two year old sheep is, while the *braisa* says that one should not use two-year old wine, but it is valid if used. This *braisa* follows Rebbe, who says not to use old wine, yet it says that it is valid. Instead,

Rava says that Rebbe says that the verse, which refers to wine as red, teaches that the redder the wine, the better. Since wine gets less red as it ages, one should not use old wine. (87a)

Working the vineyards

The *Gemora* explains that “land that was worked well” means the land was plowed twice. Rav Yosef had a corner of his orchard that he plowed twice, and the wine that it produced was so strong that it was diluted with double the normal amount of water. (87a)

Wine storage

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* that says that the barrels used for libations were the medium sized jugs of Lod. The barrels were not placed together, but with a space around each one, to prevent one from spoiling another. (87a)

The pouring of the wine

The *braisa* explains that the wine flowed until the white that appears above the sediment appeared, and the custodian then indicated by tapping with his stick that the flow should stop. The *Gemora* asks why he did not explicitly tell them to stop, and answers that this *Mishna* supports Rabbi Yochanan, who says that just as speech is helpful for grinding spices, it is damaging to wine. (87a)

Blemished wine

The *Mishna* said that Rabbi Yossi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says that wine with mold is invalid for use as libation. Rabbi Yochanan asked whether, according to Rabbi Yossi the son of Rabbi Yehudah, one would receive lashes for consecrating such wine, just as one receives lashes for consecrating an animal with a blemish. Since such wine is considered blemished, one should receive lashes, but perhaps lashes are only applicable in the case of a blemished animal, since that is the context where they are mandated. The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved. (87a)

Good quality animals

The *braisa* says that rams for the Bais Hamikdash were brought from the land of Moav, sheep from Chevron, calves from the Sharon region, and birds from Har Hamelech. Rabbi Yehudah says that they would use large sheep, which were as wide as tall. Rava bar Shaila says that Rabbi Yehudah’s

source is the verse, which blesses that Hashem will graze your flock “like a wide cushion”, indicating that wide sheep are praiseworthy. (87a)

Praying for Yerushalayim

The *Gemora* concludes by citing the verse, which states that Hashem has placed guards on the walls of Yerushalayim, which never quiet, constantly reminding Hashem, with no silence, and asking what the guards say. Rava bar Shaila says that they say the verse which asks Hashem to rise up and have mercy on Tzion, while Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says they say the verse which refers to Hashem as the builder of Yerushalayim. Rava bar Shaila says that before the destruction of Yerushalayim, they would say the verse which says that Hashem has chosen Tzion as His dwelling place. (87a)

**WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU,
KOL KORBENOS HATZIBBUR**

Dry measures

The *Mishna* says there were two dry measure utensils in the Bais Hamikdash, one an *issaron*, and one half an *issaron*. Rabbi Meir says there were three, two an *issaron* size, and one half an *issaron*. The *issaron* was used to measure the flour for all *minchah* offerings. Even for bull or ram sacrifices, which needed more than one *issaron*, there was no bigger measure, but the *issaron* measure was repeatedly used. The half *issaron* measure was used for the *Kohen Gadol’s chavitin* offering, which used half an *issaron* in the morning, and half in the afternoon.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* in which Rabbi Meir says that the verse repetition of the word *issaron* when mandating an *issaron* for each sheep (*issaron issaron lakeves ha’echad – one issaron, one issaron for [each] one sheep*) teaches that there were two *issaron* measures, a smaller one holding a heaping *issaron*, and a larger one holding a level *issaron*. The smaller one was used for all *minchah* offerings, while the larger one was used for measuring the flour for the *Kohen Gadol’s chavitin*, since it had to be split. The Sages say that

there was only one *issaron* measure, as the other verse uses *issaron* once to specify an *issaron* for each sheep (*v'issaron echad lakeves ha'echad – and one issaron for [each] one sheep*), but the verse which mentions *issaron* twice teaches that there were two measures, one of which has half an *issaron*. The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Meir learns the half *issaron* measure from the extra *vav* – and at the beginning of the word *v'issaron* – and *issaron*, while the Sages say this *vav* does not teach anything. Rabbi Meir says that the verse cited by the Sages, which refers to *one issaron*, teach that all *minchah* offerings were measured in one *issaron* units, even if they were larger than an *issaron*. The Sages learn this from the extra dot on top of the word *issaron*, while Rabbi Meir says the dot does not teach anything.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, which says that the flour for the *Kohen Gadol's chavitin* must be measured as a full *issaron*, and only then split. Rav Sheshes therefore amends the *Mishna* to say that the half *issaron* was used to *split* the flour for the *chavitin*, but not to measure it.

Rami bar Chama asked Rav Chisda whether Rabbi Meir says that the half *issaron* measure was a heaping or level measure. The *Gemora* asks why he did not ask this according to the Sages, and explains that according to the Sages, we don't know whether the *issaron* itself heaping or level. Rav Chisda answered that from Rabbi Meir's statement that the *issaron* used for the *chavitin* was level, we can learn that the half *issaron*, also used for the *chavitin*, was level. Furthermore, from Rabbi Meir's statement, we can learn that the Sages, who say that both measures were used for the *chavitin*, also say that both measures were level.

Rami bar Chama asked Rav Chisda whether the loaves of the *chavitin* were split by hand or by utensil. The *Gemora* says that it is obviously done by hand, since a balance is used to measure pieces of bread only when there is a shortage of bread, and we do not want to bring a sign of such a curse into the Bais Hamikdash.

Rami bar Chama asked Rav Chisda whether the table sanctifies a *komeitz* (handful) in the space overflowing it, i.e., its airspace. Do we say that just as the table sanctifies the bread placed in its airspace, so it sanctifies the *komeitz*, or do we say that its airspace only sanctifies bread, which is supposed to be placed there, but not a *komeitz*?

The *Gemora* tries to resolve this from Rabbi Yochanan, who says that extent of the airspace of the table, which sanctifies items placed on it, depends on the full height of the pile of breads stacked on it. This indicates that the airspace *does* sanctify something besides bread.

Rami bar Chama deflects this, saying that Rabbi Yochanan may only be referring to the airspace sanctifying the items on it, to make them invalid if not handled correctly, but not to it sanctifying the items to make them valid for service. (87a – 87b)

Liquid measures

The *Mishna* says that there were seven liquid measures:

1. *hin*
2. Half a *hin*
3. A third of a *hin*
4. A quarter of a *hin*
5. *log*
6. half a *log*
7. A quarter of a *log*

Rabbi Eliezer bar Tzadok says the one *hin* measure had demarcations to indicate the amount needed for a bull (half a *hin*), ram (third of a *hin*), or sheep (quarter a *hin*). Rabbi Shimon says that there was no *hin* measure, as there was never a need to measure a full *hin*. Rather, the seventh measure was a 1.5 *log* measure, used to measure the oil for each half of the *Kohen Gadol's chavitin*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* discussing the liquid measures in the Bais Hamikdash. Rabbi Yehudah lists the seven as in the *Mishna*, while Rabbi Meir lists them in reverse order. Rabbi Shimon says there was no *hin* measure, since it was never needed. Instead, there was a 1.5 *log* measure, which was

used to measure the oil for each half of the *chavitin*. The Sages said this was unnecessary, since it could be measured in units of half a *log*. Rabbi Shimon responded that by the same logic, there was no need for a *log* or half *log* measure, since these could be measured in units of a quarter *log*. Since this was not done, we see that measures were made for each possible unit, irrespective of whether this could be done by repeating smaller measures. Similarly, the 1.5 *log* measure was made, even though it could have been measured in units of half a *log*. The *braisa* concludes with the position of Rabbi Elazar the son of Rabbi Tzadok, who says that the *hin* measure had demarcations for the amounts needed for a bull, ram, or sheep. (87b – 88a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Mevushal wine

The *Mishna* (86b) lists the wines which were invalid for libations. Specifically, the *Mishna* lists *mevushal* – cooked wine, as an invalid wine.

The *Gemora* (Baba Basra 97a-b) states that any wine that is invalid for libation is invalid for *kiddush*, and therefore one may not use spoiled wine for *Kiddush*.

The Rambam (Shabbos 29:14) therefore rules that one may not use wine that is *mevushal* for *Kiddush*, since it is invalid for libation.

The Rosh (Baba Basra 6:10) and Tosfos (Baba Basra 97a ilaima) disagree, and say that it is valid for *Kiddush*. The Rosh explains that although *mevushal* has been altered from its natural form, it has improved, as opposed to spoiled wine, which has gotten worse. The Rosh explains that libation can only be done with wine in its natural form, and therefore *mevushal* cannot be used, even though it is better. When the *Gemora* in Baba Basra states the rule that *Kiddush* can only be said on wine that is valid for libation, this is not a blanket rule, but only excludes wine which is invalid for libation due to its degradation. Therefore, *mevushal*, although technically

invalid for libation, is high quality wine, and can be used for *Kiddush*.

The Shulchan Aruch (OH 272:8) rules that one may make *Kiddush* on *mevushal* wine, following the position of the Rosh and Tosfos. See Chazon Ovadia (Pesach, responsum 7) for a discussion of the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch, including a suggestion that this it be consistent with the Rambam's ruling, as well as the supporting responsum of the Rif.

Splitting the chavitin

The *Gemora* asks whether the *chavitin* were split by hand or by utensil, i.e. balance. The *Gemora* concludes that it was done by hand, since measuring by balance is usually done when there's a shortage, and we do not bring a sign of a curse inside the Bais Hamikdash.

Rashi explains that the *Gemora's* question was how the dough was split.

Tosfos (87b bameh) challenges this explanation, since the *Gemora* says (88b) that the quarter *log* measure was used to measure the oil for *each* of the *chavitin* loaves, indicating that the oil was poured for each loaf individually. Since we know that mixing the oil had to be done with flour, this proves that the *chavitin* were split when they were still flour. Therefore, Tosfos says the *Gemora's* question was how they split the flour. Although a balance is primarily a sign of a curse when used to measure loaves, the *Gemora's* answer is that it is also a sign of a curse when used to measure flour. Tosfos adds that the only other option would be to have a dry measure which would hold flour for each loaf, but says that such small measures are also a sign of a curse.

DAILY MASHAL

Who added the dots above certain letters in the sefer Torah?

In our *Gemora* we learn about Chazal's interpretation from the dot (*nikud*) in the Torah above the letter *vav* in the word 'issaron. *Nikud* is found in ten places in the Torah and they

are counted in *Avos deRabbi Nasan* (Ch. 34) with their interpretations.

Avos deRabbi Nasan (ibid; see *Piskei Tosfos* on our *sugya*, cited in the *Taz*, Y.D. 274, S.K. 7) says that the *nikud* was added by Ezra. As for the halachah, Rambam (*Hilchos Tefillin Umezuzah Vesefer Torah* 7:8) and the Remo (Y.D. 275:6) rule that the *nikud* should be heeded when writing a *sefer Torah* as it has been handed down through the generations. However, the *Taz* writes (274, ibid) that if the scribe didn't add the *nikud*, the *sefer Torah* is kosher as it was instituted by Ezra and the *kashrus* of a *sefer Torah* does not depend on it. (Note that the Rema of Pano [Responsa, 38] wrote that he had fear of the errors which could occur in *sifrei Torah* because of the *nikud* when, after a time, some will err that this *nikud* is *yudin* and will write a *yud* instead of the *nikud* and the *sefer* will be disqualified. Because of his suspicions, he says, "to praise the Sephardim, who refrain from adding the *nikud*". It seems from his statement that there are those who, as a first preference, refrain from adding the *nikud*; the matter needs research).

How was it allowed to add the *nikud*? As we know that we mustn't add even the slightest mark to any letter in the *sefer Torah* given to Moshe by Hashem, we must understand how Ezra added the *nikud*. The question becomes stronger from that cited in *Piskei Tosfos* (ibid): "When Ezra wrote the Torah, he made *nikud* and said, „If Moshe asks "Why did you add *nikud*?" he would say "But I didn't erase""." What does "I didn't erase" mean? Would that reply satisfy Moshe?

HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Feinstein zt"l (Responsa *Igros Moshe*, Y.D., III, 117) explains that Ezra was worthy for the Torah to be given through him if not that Moshe preceded him (Sanhedrin 21a). Therefore, he was allowed to add *nikud* in the Torah to hint at halachos passed down which, in his opinion, ought to be alluded to in the holy Torah. However, said Ezra, if Moshe contends that he also could have added *nikud* but didn't do so because the interpretations that you want to be learnt from the *nikud* should remain part of the

Oral Torah and not be explicit, I'll reply that I only made the *nikud* on condition: If he agrees to the *nikud*, then fine. If not, the *nikud* should not be treated as something which limits the meaning of the words but as insignificant, as the *nikud* is not mixed in the words but hangs between the lines and it is not obviously part of the *sefer Torah*.

Symbols etched with a metal marker between the lines: Rabbi Feinstein uses this idea to decide between a difference of opinions about certain *sifrei Torah* of Yemenite communities. These *sifrei Torah* had special signs marked with an iron nib, without ink, between the lines to ease the reading and mark the ends of verses.

Some *poskim* disqualified these *sifrei Torah* as *Shulchan 'Aruch* (Y.D. 274:7) rules: "A voweled *sefer Torah* is disqualified...and the same applies to a *sefer* divided into verses." In other words, if the end of a verse is marked by ink, the *sefer* is disqualified, as we mustn't change the form of the *sefer Torah* as given by Moshe (*Beis Yosef* in Ramban's name).

Symbols not understood without an explanation do not disqualify: However, Rabbi Feinstein contended that the marks in the Yemenite *sifrei Torah* do not disqualify them as they were not made with ink and only appeared between lines. This is not the usual way to add *nikud* to letters and should not be regarded as an addition to the writing as without an exact explanation, no one would know their meaning. As mentioned about Ezra, signs whose content is unclear without an oral explanation are not regarded as having an independent content and therefore they do not disqualify a *sefer Torah*.