



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

All the measures in the Temple were heaped (*and through heaping, a full-measure is reached*) except that which was used for *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, which included the heap (*inside of it – meaning that his issaron measure was slightly larger than an ordinary one, and it would contain an issaron even when it was leveled out*).

With respect to liquid measures, the overbrim is sanctified, but the overbrim of the dry measures was not sanctified. Rabbi Akiva said: The vessels used for liquids were holy, and consequently, their overbrim is sacred. The vessels designated for solids were not holy at all, and therefore, their overbrim is not sacred. Rabbi Yosi said: That is not the reason, but rather, it is because the liquids become displaced (*from within the vessel as it is being poured*), whereas solids do not become displaced. (90a)

Overbrim

The *Gemora* explains the point at issue between the *Tannaim* of the *Mishna*: The *Tanna Kamma* is of the opinion that the vessels used for liquids were anointed on the inside and the outside (*and therefore they would sanctify that which was inside of them, and even that which came into contact with the outside of the vessel*). The vessels used for solids were anointed only on the inside, but not on the outside (*and therefore anything which was above the rim was not sanctified*). Rabbi Akiva, however, is of the opinion that the liquid measures were anointed on the inside and the outside, but the dry measures were not anointed at all. Rabbi Yosi

maintains that both the liquid measures and the dry measures were anointed on the inside only and not on the outside; and this is the reason for the distinction between liquid measures and dry measures: the liquids become displaced from within the vessel as it is being poured, whereas solids do not become displaced.

The *Gemora* asks: But even if the liquids are displaced from within, what does it matter? The person surely intends to sanctify only that which he requires for the offering (*and not any more*)?

Rav Dimi bar Shishna said in the name of Rav: This proves that service vessels can sanctify even without specific intention.

Ravina answered: In truth, I can tell you that service vessels sanctify only with specific intention, nevertheless, the Rabbis decreed that the overbrim is sanctified, for otherwise, people will say that one may remove that which has already been consecrated in a vessel and revert it to a non-sanctity state.

Rabbi Zeira asked from the following *Mishna*: If one arranged the *lechem hapanim* and the spoons (*of levonah*) on the Table on Sunday, and he burned the spoons of *levonah* on the next *Shabbos*, it is not valid (*for it is required to be on the Shulchan from Shabbos to Shabbos*). What should one do (*in this case*)? He should leave it until the following *Shabbos*, for even if it remains many days on the Table there is no concern. But why should this be allowed? Should we not be concerned that people will say that one may leave things in a service vessel (*for an extended period of time without becoming invalidated due to ‘linah’ – remaining overnight*)?

The *Gemora* answers: You cannot point out a contradiction between that which is performed inside (*the Sanctuary*) and that which is performed outside (*in the Courtyard*); not everybody is aware of that which is performed inside (*and therefore we allow the breads and levonah to remain on the Table for longer than a week*), but that which is performed outside, everyone is aware of (*and therefore we were concerned about that which is removed from within the service vessel*).

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna*: The surplus from the *nesachim* was used to purchase (*olah*) offerings for the dry season (*as dessert*) of the Altar (*so it should not remain idle*).

The *Gemora* asks: What is meant by ‘the surplus of the *nesachim*’?

Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef said: It is referring to the overbrim of the measures.

Rabbi Yochanan said: It is like we learned in a different *Mishna*: If someone accepted to provide flour (*for the flour-offerings in the Temple*) at a price of four *se’ahs per sela*, and the price then rose to three (*se’ahs per sela*), he must provide it at the accepted price of four *se’ahs per sela*. If he accepted to provide it at a price of three *se’ahs per sela*, and the price then fell to four (*se’ahs per sela*), he must provide it at the new price of four *se’ahs per sela*, for *hekdesh* always has the upper hand.

The *Gemora* cites a supporting *braisa* for Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef as well as one that supports Rabbi Yochanan.

The following *braisa* supports Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef: What was done with the overbrim of the measures? If there was another animal offering present, it may be offered with it; and if it had been left overnight (*for there was no offering available*), it is invalid (*on account of linah*). If not (*there was no offering available and it was not left overnight*), it is

offered as ‘dessert’ for the Altar. This ‘dessert’ is *olah* offerings; the meat is for Hashem and the skins are given to the *Kohanim*.

The following *braisa* supports Rabbi Yochanan: If someone accepted to provide flour (*for the flour-offerings in the Temple*) at a price of four *se’ahs per sela*, and the price then rose to three (*se’ahs per sela*), he must provide it at the accepted price of four *se’ahs per sela*. If he accepted to provide it at a price of three *se’ahs per sela*, and the price then fell to four (*se’ahs per sela*), he must provide it at the new price of four *se’ahs per sela*, for *hekdesh* always has the upper hand. This illustrates that which we have learned: The surplus from the *nesachim* was used as dessert for the Altar. (90a – 90b)

Mishna

All communal and individual offerings require libations except the *bechor*, *ma’aser*, the *pesach* sacrifice, *chatas* and *asham*; but the *chatas* and *asham* of the *metzora* require libations. (90b)

Scriptural Sources

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which provides the Scriptural sources for the rulings regarding libations taught in the *Mishna*:

Olah – not a *minchah* (*when one offers a minchah, he does not bring libations with it*).

A sacrifice – includes a *shelamim*.

“Or” a *sacrifice* – includes a *todah* offering.

By expressing a vow or a donation – only something that comes as a vow or donation (this excludes a *bechor*, *ma’aser*, *pesach*, *chatas* and *asham*).

Or on your festivals – includes offerings brought on the festivals (*such as the olas re’iyah and the shalmei chagigah*).

When a young bull... - it must be something that comes as a vow or donation (*thus excluding the chatas goats that are brought for mussaf offerings on the festivals*).



To produce a pleasing aroma to Hashem from the cattle or from the flock – this excludes an *olah* bird – according to Rabbi Yoshiyah.

Sacrifice – excludes a bird offering – according to Rabbi Yonasan.

From the cattle “or” from the flock – if one vows to bring an *olah* offering, he may bring one animal or two. This is according to R’ Yonasan. Now, even though he maintains that generally, when the Torah lists two items, it means either one, unless they are explicitly joined by the word “together,” here I might have thought that the expression “and the flock” specifically joins them together. Rabbi Yoshiyah, however, maintains that even when the word “together” is not mentioned, it still connotes “together,” there are two verses in the beginning of Vayikra which indicate that only one animal is required for the fulfillment of his vow. Rabbi Yonasan says that those verses are necessary in order to teach us that this *halachah* applies whether he stated explicitly that he intends to bring one of these two types of animals, and even if he did not specify. (90b – 91a)

DAILY MASHAL

For whose Sake?

There are those who maintain that a service vessel does not sanctify without intention.

There are various explanations for this:

1. Intention is not necessary because it is the person who provides the sanctification through the vessel, rather, it is the vessel which sanctifies that which is inside of it - there is a condition that it must be placed inside with intention. [Oneg Yom Tov]
2. The intention is not for the purpose of sanctification; rather intention is needed that the vessel should perform that which it was intended for. For example: The purpose of the oven was to bake

the *minchah* offering and the show breads. If he intended that the oven should bake these loaves - even if he did not have “sanctification” in mind, it is regarded as intention, and it sanctifies that which is inside of it. However, those vessels - where items placed inside of them are only for the purpose of sanctification - such items need to be placed inside the service vessel for the sake of sanctification. [Mikdash Dovid]

Do we stop and think before the performance of our daily actions? What is our intention? Are we doing this for the sake of heaven, or perhaps for ‘our own sake’?