

A High Priest sacrifices offerings when he is an acute mourner – כהן גדול מקריב אוגן – A High Priest serves in the Temple even when he is an acute mourner, and his service is valid. This ruling is in accordance with the mishna and the opinion of Rabbi Yosei in the *baraita* (*Tosafot*; *Kesef Mishneh*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 2:6).

A High Priest does not eat from offerings when he is an acute mourner – כהן גדול אוגן אינו אוכל – Although a High Priest serves in the Temple when he is an acute mourner, he may not eat from the offerings for that entire day (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 2:8).

NOTES

To bring him from his house – להביאו מתוך ביתו: Some explain that the reason he is brought to the Temple is that if he remains at home, there is concern that the High Priest in his grief might touch the corpse of his relative, an act that is prohibited.

A priest was standing and sacrificing – הייה עומד ומקריב – Most of the commentaries claim that the Gemara is referring to the High Priest (*Tosafot*; *Tosafot Yeshanim*; *Tosefot Ri HaLavan*; *Tosefot HaRosh*; Ritva). The author of the *Me'iri* agrees with Rashi that the Gemara is referring to a common priest and that had the Gemara been referring to a High Priest, it would have mentioned it explicitly (Ritva explaining Rashi's opinion).

הגנו רבנן: כהן גדול מקריב אוגן, ואינו אוכל. רבי יהודה אומר: כל היום. מאי "כל היום"? אומר רבא: לא נצרכה אלא להביאו מתוך ביתו.

§ Apropos the death of the wife of the High Priest, the Gemara cites an additional *baraita*. The Sages taught: A High Priest sacrifices offerings when he is an acute mourner,^h on the day of a relative's death, but does not eat from those offerings.^h Rabbi Yehuda says: The entire day. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase: The entire day? Rava said: This phrase is necessary only to bring him from his house.ⁿ Not only is it permitted for the High Priest to serve in the Temple when he is an acute mourner, but it is a mitzva to bring him from his house to serve in the Temple for the entire day to help ease his pain.

אמר ליה אבוי: השתא לרבי יהודה אפוקי מפקינן ליה, דתנמא: היה עומד ומקריב על גבי המזבח, ושמע שמות לו מת – מניח עבודתו ויוצא, דברי רבי יהודה. רבי יוסי אומר: יגמור. ואת אמרת מיייתנין ליה מתוך ביתו?

Abaye said to him: Now, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, we remove the High Priest from the Temple when he is an acute mourner, as it was taught in a *baraita*: If a common priest was standing and sacrificingⁿ an offering on top of the altar and heard that a relative of his died, he leaves his service in the middle and exits the Temple; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: He completes the service and then leaves. Rabbi Yehuda rules stringently in the case of a priest who is an acute mourner sacrificing an offering. Even though the *baraita* is referring to a common priest, it is reasonable to say that the same is true with regard to a High Priest as well. Rabbi Yehuda says that a High Priest who becomes an acute mourner exits the Temple, and you say we bring the High Priest who is an acute mourner from his house to serve?

אלא אומר רבא: מאי "כל היום"?

Rather, Rava said: The initial interpretation must be rejected. What is the meaning of the phrase: The entire day?

Perek I

Daf 14 Amud a

לומר שאינו עובד כל היום, גזירה שמא יאכל. אמר ליה רב אדא בר אבהו לרבא: ומי גזר רבי יהודה שמא יאכל? והתנן, רבי יהודה אומר: אף אשה אחרת מתקנינן לו, שמא תמות אשתו. ואי מיתא אשתו – עביד עבודה, ולא גזר רבי יהודה שמא יאכל! אמר ליה: הכי השתא? התם, כיון דיום הכפורים הוא, דכולי עלמא לא קא אכלי – הוא נמי לא אטי למיכל. הכא דכולי עלמא אכלי – הוא נמי אטי למיכל.

Rabbi Yehuda means to say that the High Priest does not serve for the entire day even though the Torah allows him to do so, due to a rabbinic decree lest he forget that he is an acute mourner and eat consecrated food forbidden to him. Rav Adda bar Ahava said to Rava: And did Rabbi Yehuda issue a decree lest he eat?ⁿ But didn't we learn in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: The Sages would even designate another wife for him lest his wife die? And if his wife dies, he nevertheless performs the Temple service, and Rabbi Yehuda did not issue a decree lest he eat. That contradicts the other statement by Rabbi Yehuda that a High Priest may not serve for the entire day that he is an acute mourner. Rava said to him: How can these cases be compared? There, in the mishna, since it is Yom Kippur, when everyone does not eat, he too will not come to eat. However, here, during the rest of the year, when everyone eats, he too will come to eat. Therefore, a decree was issued.

וכי האי גוונא מי חיילא עליה אננות? והא מיגרשא! נהי דאננות לא חייל עליה, אטרודי מי לא מטריד?

The Gemara raises a question from a different perspective: And in a case like this, would the halakhic status of acute mourning take effect on him, considering that she is divorced? According to Rabbi Yehuda, the High Priest must give his wife a provisional divorce in which case she is no longer his wife and if she dies he is no longer obligated to mourn her. The Gemara answers: Although the status of acute mourning does not take effect on him, is he not troubled over the death of his wife? Therefore, according to Rabbi Yehuda, it is appropriate to prohibit his performance of the service on that day.

NOTES

And did Rabbi Yehuda issue a decree lest he eat – ומי גזר: In the *Magen Avraham* the following question is raised: If that is indeed a concern, there should be concern lest the High Priest forget himself and eat at any point during the Yom Kippur service. Some answer that this is not a legitimate concern, as the entire Yom Kippur service would be abandoned in that case (Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes). Others explain that this is not a significant concern, since most of the day's offerings are not eaten (*Mitzpe Eitan*). Yet others explain that the concern lest an acute mourner eat sacrificial food is greater than the concern lest the High Priest eat on Yom Kippur. The prohibition for an acute mourner is to eat an olive-bulk of food, whereas the prohibition on Yom Kippur is to eat a dried fig-bulk (*Ohel Moshe*).

The practice of the High Priest – הרגלת כהן גדול בעבודה – The Sages accustom the High Priest in the Yom Kippur service during the seven days of his sequestering. He sprinkles the blood, burns the incense, and removes the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum so that he will be prepared to perform the service on Yom Kippur (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 1:5).

The High Priest sacrifices any portion that he chooses first – בהן גדול מקריב חלק בראש – During the year, the High Priest does not participate in the lottery like the rest of the priests, but may perform any service that he chooses. He may also take any portion that he chooses before the other priests (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 5:12).

One who intended to sprinkle purification water on an animal – נתכוון להזות על הבהמה – If one intends to sprinkle purification water on an animal or on any object not susceptible to impurity, and instead sprinkles on a person, the sprinkling is invalid. The individual must dip the hyssop into the water again and sprinkle with the appropriate intention. However, if he intends to sprinkle on an object susceptible to impurity, and instead sprinkles on an animal, he sprinkles again with the water remaining on the hyssop and need not dip it into the water again (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 10:8; see Ra'avad, who disagrees, and *Kesef Mishne*).

מתני' כל שבועת הימים הוא זרק את הדם ומקטיר את הקטורת, ומיטיב את הנרות, ומקריב את הראש ואת הרגל ושאר כל הימים, אם רצה להקריב – מקריב. שבהן גדול מקריב חלק בראש, ונוטל חלק בראש.

גמ' מאן תנא? אמר רב חסדיא: דלא כרבי עקיבא. דאי רבי עקיבא – הא אמר: טהור שנפלה עליו הזאה – טמאתו, היכי עביד עבודה?

דתנא: "והזה הטהור על הטמא" על הטמא – טהור, ועל הטהור – טמא. דברי רבי עקיבא. והכמים אומרים: אין הדברים הללו אמורין אלא בדברים המקבילים טמאה.

מאי היא – כדתנן: נתכוון להזות על הבהמה והזה על האדם, אם יש באיזוב – ישנה, נתכוון להזות על האדם והזה על הבהמה, אם יש באיזוב – לא ישנה.

MISHNA During all seven days of the High Priest's sequestering before Yom Kippur, he sprinkles the blood of the daily burnt-offering, and he burns the incense, and he removes the ashes of the lamps of the candelabrum, and he sacrifices the head and the hind legⁿ of the daily offering. The High Priest performs these tasks in order to grow accustomed to the services that he will perform on Yom Kippur.^h On all the other days of the year, if the High Priest wishes to sacrifice any of the offerings, he sacrifices them, as the High Priest sacrifices any portion that he chooses first^h and takes any portion that he chooses first.

GEMARA The Gemara asks: Who is the *tanna* who taught this mishna? Rav Hisda said: This mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, as if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, it is difficult. Didn't Rabbi Akiva say: With regard to a ritually pure person upon whom a sprinkling of purification water fell, it renders him impure? This is based on the enigmatic principle with regard to the water of the red heifer: It purifies the ritually impure and renders impure the ritually pure. If so, how can the High Priest perform the Temple service? The High Priest is sprinkled with purification water on each of the seven days of his sequestering due to the possibility that he was impure with impurity imparted by a corpse. However, it is possible that he is ritually pure. If he is ritually pure, the sprinkling will render him impure.

As it was taught in a *baraita* that it is written: "And the pure person will sprinkle it upon the impure person" (Numbers 19:19); this emphasis that he sprinkles the water upon the impure person comes to teach that if he sprinkled on the ritually impure person, that person becomes pure; but if he sprinkled on the pure person, that person becomes ritually impure. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. And the Rabbis say: These matters are stated to teach that it is considered sprinkling only if it is performed on items susceptible to impurity, whereas if the water was sprinkled on items not susceptible to impurity, it is not considered sprinkling.

What is the halakhic implication of that statement? It is as we learned in a mishna: With regard to one who mistakenly intended to sprinkle purification water on an animal,^{hn} which does not become impure when alive, but happened to sprinkle it upon an impure person, if water remains on the hyssop that he used to sprinkle the water, he should repeat the action and sprinkle the purification water on the person to purify him. Since the first sprinkling was onto a person, who can become impure, the water remaining on the hyssop may be reused, and it is not disqualified by improper use. However, with regard to one who intended to sprinkle purification water on a person but happened to sprinkle it upon an animal, even if water remains on the hyssop, he should not repeat the action. Since the first sprinkling was onto an animal, which cannot become impure, the water is disqualified by improper use, and may not be used in a second sprinkling.

NOTES

The head and the hind leg – את הראש ואת הרגל – These parts are mentioned because when the sacrifice is cut into pieces, they are removed first. Therefore, in deference to the High Priest, it is appropriate to give those portions to him (*Meleket Shlomo*).

One who intended to sprinkle purification water on an animal, etc. – נתכוון להזות על הבהמה וכי – There are two contradictory versions of this passage. The variant reading is: If one intended to sprinkle on an animal but instead sprinkled on a person, he must repeat the sprinkling; however, if he intended to sprinkle on a person and sprinkled on an animal, he need not repeat the sprinkling, independent of whether or not water remains on the hyssop (see Rabbeinu Hananel and Rabbi

Shimshon of Saens on tractate *Para*). The term: He should repeat, can be understood in two ways: Most commentaries explain that the priest should sprinkle a second time with the water remaining on the hyssop; however, the *Me'iri* explains that the individual dips the hyssop in the water a second time and should not use the water remaining on the hyssop.

There is also a dispute with regard to the rationale for this *halakha*. Rashi explains that if the purification water was used to sprinkle on an animal, it is disqualified due to improper use. However, if water is unintentionally sprinkled on a person, it is not disqualified. Most commentaries are not concerned that the purification water was improperly used; however, there is a special *halakha* invalidating purification water sprinkled

on an object not susceptible to impurity (*Tosafot*; Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna; *Tosafot Yeshanim*).

Based on the variant reading of the Gemara, there is a dispute whether the status of the water is determined by the act that was performed, i.e., the sprinkling of water on an animal, or by the intention, i.e., that one intended to sprinkle on an animal (see Rabbi Shimshon of Saens on tractate *Para*; Ritva). Another approach explains that if the priest does not sprinkle the water properly, either due to improper intention or improper action, he becomes impure himself. Consequently, he renders the water impure. It is thereby disqualified for use in further sprinkling (Rabbeinu Tam; *Tosafot Yeshanim*; Rabbi Shimshon of Saens).

A pure person upon whom they sprinkled purification water – טְהוֹר שְׁהוּז עָלָיו – The question was raised that even according to the Rabbis, who hold that a pure person is not rendered impure by the sprinkling of purification waters, once the water was sprinkled upon him, he carries or touches the water and that should render him impure. Some explain that water sprinkled upon a person is not considered contact that renders one impure. Others explain that once he was sprinkled with the water, the water was disqualified due to improper use and therefore no longer renders one impure.

He who sprinkles means he who touches – מאי טְהוֹר שְׁהוּז עָלָיו – מִזְחָה – נוֹגַע: *Tosafot* ask how could the Sages say that the one who performs the sprinkling is ritually pure, contrary to the plain meaning of the verse. They propose that when the Torah says: And the pure person will sprinkle it upon the impure person, it means that the pure person remains pure even after sprinkling (*Tosefot HaRosh; Tosafot*).

מאי טעמא דרבי עקיבא – נכתוב רחמנא: "והזהו הטהור עליו", מאי "על הטמא" – שמע מינה: על הטמא טהור ועל הטהור טמא. ורבנן: האי לדברים המקבלין טומאה הוא דאתא. אבל הכא – קל וחומר הוא: אם על הטמא טהור – על הטהור לא כל שכן!

ורבי עקיבא – היינו דקאמר שלמה: "אמרתי אחקמה והיא רחוקה ממני". – ורבנן: ההוא למזה ולמזין עליו – טהור, ונוגע בהן – טמא.

ומזה טהור?! והכתוב: "ומזה מי הנדה יכבס בגדיו!" מאי מזה – נוגע. והכתוב "מזה", והא כתוב "נוגע!" ועוד: מזה – בעי כיבוס בגדים, נוגע – לא בעי כיבוס בגדים.

אלא, מאי מזה – נושא. ונכתוב רחמנא נושא, מאי טעמא כתיב מזה? הא קא משמע לן: דבעינן שיעור הוזה.

הניחא למאן דאמר הוזה צריכה שיעור, אלא למאן דאמר הוזה אין צריכה שיעור – מאי איכא למימר? אפילו למאן דאמר הוזה אין צריכה שיעור – הני מילי אנבא דגברא, אבל במנא צריכה שיעור. דתנן: כמה יהא בהן ויהא כדי הוזה – כדי שיטבול

The Gemara analyzes the basis of the dispute: **What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Akiva?** Instead of writing: And the pure person will sprinkle it upon the impure person, **let the Merciful One write in the Torah: And the pure person will sprinkle it upon him**, and it would be clear that it is upon the aforementioned impure person. **What is taught by the phrase: Upon the impure person? Learn from it that if he sprinkled on the impure person, that person becomes pure; but if he sprinkled on the pure person, that person becomes impure. And the Rabbis say with regard to that phrase: It comes to teach that it is only considered sprinkling if it is performed on items susceptible to impurity. However, here, with regard to sprinkling purification water on a pure person, it is derived through an *a fortiori* inference that he remains ritually pure.^N If the water falls on the impure person, he is pure; if the water falls on the pure person, all the more so is it not clear that he remains pure?**

And Rabbi Akiva would respond to that *a fortiori* inference: **That is what King Solomon said: "I said I would become wise, but it eludes me"** (Ecclesiastes 7:23). According to tradition, even Solomon in his great wisdom could not understand the contradictory nature of the sprinkling of purification water that purifies an impure person and impurifies a pure person. **And the Rabbis ascribe Solomon's bewilderment to a different aspect of the *halakha*: The one who sprinkles the water and the one upon whom one sprinkles the water are pure; but one who touches the water unrelated to sprinkling is impure.^H**

The Gemara asks: **Is the one who sprinkles the water actually pure? Isn't it written: "He who sprinkles the purification waters will wash his clothes, and he who touches the purification waters will be unclean until evening"** (Numbers 19:21)? The Gemara responds: **What is the meaning of the term: He who sprinkles? It means: He who touches.^N But isn't it written: He who sprinkles? And isn't it written in the same verse: And he who touches? And furthermore, in that verse, one who sprinkles requires washing of his clothes, indicating a more severe level of impurity, whereas one who touches does not require washing of his clothes.** Apparently, when it is written: He who sprinkles, it is not referring to one who touches.

Rather, the Rabbis assert: **What is the meaning of: He who sprinkles?** It refers to **one who carries** the purification water.^H The Gemara asks: **But if so, let the Merciful One write: One who carries; what is the reason that he who sprinkles is written if the reference is to carrying?** The Gemara answers: **This use of the term sprinkling to depict carrying teaches us that in order to become impure from carrying purification water, one must carry the measure required for sprinkling.^H**

The Gemara asks: **This works out well according to the one who said that sprinkling requires a minimum measure of water, as then the concept of a measure required for sprinkling has meaning. However, according to the one who said that sprinkling does not require a minimum measure of water,^H what can be said?** There is no concept of a measure required for sprinkling. The Gemara answers: **Even according to the one who said that sprinkling does not require a minimum measure of water, that applies only to the measure of purification water that must be sprinkled on the back of the impure man; any amount will suffice. However, in the vessel into which one dips the hyssop in order to sprinkle the water, a certain measure of water is required, as we learned in a mishna: How much water should be in the vessel so that it will be equivalent to the measure required for sprinkling? It must be equivalent to the measure required to dip**

HALAKHA

נוגע – One who touches the purification water becomes impure – **במי תטאת טמא**: One who touches purification water for a purpose other than sprinkling becomes impure until the evening. His garments do not become impure (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 15:1).

נושא במי תטאת – One who carries purification water for a purpose other than sprinkling becomes impure, as do his clothes (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 15:1).

שיעור הוזה – Purification water renders one who touches or carries it impure only if there is a certain measure of water, sufficient to dip the tops of the stems of the hyssop branch into the water (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 15:1).

הוזה – Sprinkling does not require a minimum measure of water – **אין צריכה שיעור**: There is no minimum measure of purification water required to purify an impure person; any measure suffices (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 10:8).

NOTES

Removing the ashes from the lamps – הַטְּבַת הַנְּרוֹת: The commentaries and legal authorities dispute whether this term connotes merely clearing the ashes and wicks and cleaning the lamps, or if the primary purpose of this service is in fact lighting those lamps in which oil remained to burn the rest of the day (Ramban on Exodus 27:20). Burning the remaining oil prepares the lamps for relighting at the end of the day.

Who is the *tanna* who taught the *mishnayot* in tractate *Tamid* – מאן תנא תמיד: *Tosafot Yeshanim* ask why Rav Huna concluded that the *tanna* who taught the *mishnayot* in tractate *Tamid* was Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, and answer that Rav Huna knew that Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa was involved in the discussion of the matters of that tractate. However, only once the *baraita* was cited was it clear that tractate *Tamid* was not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa. Indeed, it is common that although most of a given tractate is in accordance with the opinion of a certain *tanna*, there may nevertheless be several unattributed opinions that are in accordance with a different *tanna* (see *Tosefot Ri HaLavan*).

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa – רבי שמעון איש המצפה: This Sage is mentioned in talmudic literature only a few times. It is known that he was a contemporary of Rabban Gamliel the Elder and lived when the Temple stood. Based on the Gemara here, he was apparently responsible for the preliminary arrangement of the *mishnayot* of one of the tractates that was edited and augmented by later Sages.

ראשי גבעולין, ויזה. אביי אומר: אפילו תימא רבי עקיבא, דעביד עבודה כוליה יומא, ולפניא מדו עליה, וטביל, ועביד הערב השמש.

”ומקטיר את הקטורת ומטיב את הנירות. אלמא קטורת ברישא והדר נרות, ורמינהו: מי שזכה בדישון מביח הפנימי ומי שזכה במנורה, ומי שזכה בקטורת!”

אמר רב הונא: מאן תנא תמיד – רבי שמעון איש המצפה הוא. והא איפכא שמעינן ליה, דתנן: בא לו לקרן מזרחית צפונית – נותן מזרחה צפונה, מערבית דרומית – נותן מערבה דרומה,

ותני עלה: רבי שמעון איש המצפה משנה בתמיד, מזרחית צפונית – נותן מזרחה צפונה, מערבית דרומית – נותן מערבה, ואחר כך נותן דרומה!

אלא אומר רבי יוחנן: מאן תנא סדר יומא – רבי שמעון איש המצפה הוא.

the tops of the stems of the hyssop branch into the water and sprinkle it. Apparently, even according to the one who said that there is no minimum measure of water in the vessel there is a minimum measure for sprinkling. Abaye said: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said that the purification water impurifies the pure, the difficulty can be resolved: The High Priest performs the Temple service for the entire day on each of the seven days of sequestering, and toward the evening the priests sprinkle the purification water upon him. Even if he was pure and the sprinkling rendered him impure, he immerses immediately and observes the requirement to wait until sunset, at which point he is purified and prepared to serve the next day.

§ The mishna teaches that on each of the seven days the High Priest burns the incense and removes the ashes from the lamps.^N Apparently, incense is burned first, and then the lamps are cleaned. And the Gemara raises a contradiction from a mishna in tractate *Tamid* that discusses the lottery in which the priests performing the various tasks that constitute the morning Temple service are selected. That mishna first mentions the one who was privileged to be selected to perform removal of the ashes from the inner altar, and then the one who was privileged to be selected to remove the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum, and only then does it deal with the one who is privileged to be selected burn the incense. According to that mishna, removing ashes from the candelabrum precedes the burning of the incense.

Rav Huna said: Who is the *tanna* who taught the *mishnayot* in tractate *Tamid*?^N It is Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa,^P who disagrees with the *tanna* of the mishna here. The Gemara asks: But didn't we learn the opposite, as we learned in the mishna in tractate *Tamid*: The priest sprinkles the blood of the daily offering on the altar.^H He comes to the northeast corner of the altar and sprinkles once on the northeast corner. From there he proceeds to the southwest corner and sprinkles once on the southwest corner.

And it was taught in the *Tosefta* concerning this mishna: Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa changes the sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering relative to the sprinkling of blood of all other burnt-offerings. He agrees with the first *tanna* with regard to the first sprinkling of the blood; the priest comes to the northeast corner and sprinkles once on the northeast corner. However, when he proceeds to the southwest corner he does not sprinkle once as he would when offering a burnt-offering; rather, he sprinkles on the west side of the altar and then sprinkles on the south side. Since the disputing opinion is that of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, apparently the unattributed opinions in the *mishnayot* in tractate *Tamid* are not the opinions of Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa.

Rather, there must be a different resolution to the contradiction between the mishna here and the one in tractate *Tamid*. Rabbi Yohanan said: Who is the *tanna* who taught the Yom Kippur service in tractate *Yoma*? It is Rabbi Shimon Ish HaMitzpa, and tractate *Tamid* is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis who disagree with him.

HALAKHA

Sprinkling the blood of the daily offering – זריקת דם: The sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering, like that of the burnt-offering, is performed in the following manner: The priest takes blood from the bowl and sprinkles it first at the northeast corner, then at the southwest corner, intending in each instance that the blood will reach both sides (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 5:6).

The second lottery – פּיּוּס הַשְּׁנִי – Thirteen priests were chosen in the second lottery in the Temple. The one who was chosen in the lottery slaughters the daily morning offering, the priest next to him receives the blood, and so on, following the sequence of the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:6).

Burning the incense and removing the ashes from the lamps – הַקְטֹרֶת וְהַטְּבֵה: The priest privileged to burn the incense enters first, followed by the priest privileged to remove the ashes from the candelabrum and clean the two lamps, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 6:4).

NOTES

Abaye said this is not difficult – אָמַר אַבְיֵי: לֹא קָשִׁיא – *Tosafot* explain that based on the formulation of the Gemara, Abaye is not suggesting an entirely new solution but accepts Rabbi Yoḥanan's opinion, adding to and refining it. He does so because it is clear from tractate *Tamid* that there is an alternative opinion with regard to the order of the offerings as well as the two lamps. Therefore, it is possible to resolve only the contradiction between this mishna and the mishna in the second chapter (*Tosafot Yeshanim; Tosafot HaRosh*).

Here the mishna is discussing the removal of the ashes from two lamps – בְּהִטְבַּת שְׁתֵּי נֵרוֹת – *Tosafot* ask: Why does the mishna list the lighting of the two lamps, which is performed later, rather than the lighting of the five lamps, which is performed earlier? Apparently *Tosafot* and other sources hold that failure to remove the ashes from the five lamps does not invalidate the service and may even be performed by a non-priest. Therefore, the High Priest did not perform that service (*Mishnat Aharon*).

The removal of the ashes from five lamps – הִטְבַּת חֲמֵשׁ נֵרוֹת – When the priest arrived he would discover that several of the lamps had been extinguished. However, according to tradition, at least one lamp, the western lamp, remained burning. This is why that lamp and the one next to it were only rekindled or cleaned after the ashes were removed from the other five (Rabbi Elyakim).

וְרַמִּי סֵדֵר יוֹמָא אֶסְדֵּר יוֹמָא, דְּתַנּוּ: פּיּוּס הַשְּׁנִי – מִי שׁוֹחֵט, מִי זוֹרֵק, מִי מְדַשֵּׁן מִזְבֵּחַ הַפְּנִימִי, וּמִי מְדַשֵּׁן אֶת הַמְּנוֹרָה, וּמִי מַעֲלֶה אֲבָרִים לְכַבֵּשׁ. פּיּוּס הַשְּׁלִישִׁי: חֲדָשִׁים לְקַטֹּרֶת בּוֹאוּ וְהִפְסִיאוּ!

The Gemara raises a contradiction from one mishna in tractate *Yoma* against another mishna in tractate *Yoma*, as we learned in a mishna: **The second lottery^h** conducted daily among the priests determined the following: **Who slaughters the daily morning offering; who sprinkles its blood; who removes the ashes from the inner altar; and who removes the ashes and burnt wicks from the candelabrum; and who takes the limbs of the daily offering up to the ramp to be burned later.** Following the second lottery the priests dispersed, and they later reconvened for **the third lottery.** Before the third lottery, the appointee declared: Let only those priests who are **new to offering the incense come and participate in the lottery** for the incense. Apparently, removing the ashes from the lamps of the candelabrum preceded the burning of the incense, which contradicts the mishna here.

אָמַר אַבְיֵי: לֹא קָשִׁיא: כָּאן – בְּהִטְבַּת שְׁתֵּי נֵרוֹת, כָּאן – בְּהִטְבַּת חֲמֵשׁ נֵרוֹת.

Abaye said: This is **not difficult.**^N Here, the mishna is discussing the removal of the ashes from **two lamps,**^N which is performed after the burning of the incense; **there,** the mishna of the lotteries is discussing the removal of the ashes from **five lamps,**^N which precedes the burning of the incense. As will be explained, the priest attends to five lamps first, and after a break, he attends to the final two lamps.

לְמִימָרָא דְּבִקְטוֹרֶת מִפְּסִיק לְהוּ? וְהָא אַבְיֵי מְסַדֵּר מַעֲרֵכָה מִשְׁמִיחָה דְּגִמְרָא, בְּדַם הַתְּמִיד מִפְּסִיק לְהוּ! אָמַר: לֹא קָשִׁיא: הֵיא – לְאַבָּא שְׂאוּל, הָא – לְרַבְּנָן. דְּתַנּוּ: לֹא יֵיטִיב אֶת הַנְּרוֹת וְאַחַר כֵּן יִקְטֹר, אֶלָּא יִקְטֹר וְאַחַר כֵּן יֵיטִיב. אַבָּא שְׂאוּל אוֹמַר: מִיטִיב וְאַחַר כֵּן מִקְטֹר.

The Gemara asks: **Is that to say that the burning of the incense interposes between attending to the first five lamps and attending the last two? But when Abaye related the order of the daily priestly functions in the name of tradition, didn't he state that it was the sprinkling of the blood of the daily offering that interposed between the five lamps and the two, not the burning of the incense?** The Sages say in response: This is **not difficult.** That sequence cited by Abaye is in accordance with the opinion of **Abba Shaul,** whereas this sequence cited in the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **the Rabbis, as it was taught in a baraita:** One should not remove the ashes from the lamps and then burn the incense; rather one should burn the incense and then remove the ashes from the lamps. **Abba Shaul says: One removes the ashes from the lamps and then burns the incense.**^H The different sources reflect the dispute cited in the *baraita*.

מֵאִי טַעְמָא דְּאַבָּא שְׂאוּל – דְּכַתִּיב: “בִּבְקָר בְּבִקְר בְּהִיטִיבוּ אֶת הַנְּרוֹת” וְהָדֵר “יִקְטֹרֶנָּה”. וְרַבְּנָן: מֵאִי קָאָמַר רַחֲמֵנָּא –

The Gemara asks: **What is the rationale for the opinion of Abba Shaul?** It is as it is written: “Every morning when he removes the ashes from the lamps, he shall burn it” (Exodus 30:7), and then it is written: “He shall burn it” (Exodus 30:8). First the lamps are cleaned, and only then is the incense burned. **And how do the Rabbis, who hold that the incense was burned first, interpret this verse? They say: What is the Merciful One saying?**

Perek I
Daf 15 Amud a

בְּעֵינֵי הַטְּבֵה תְּהֵא מִקְטֹר קַטֹּרֶת. דְּאִי לֹא תִימָא הֵי, “בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים” דְּכַתִּיב: “וּבְהַעֲלוֹת אַהֲרֹן אֶת הַנְּרוֹת בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים יִקְטֹרֶנָּה” הֵי נָמִי דְּבִרְיָשָׁא מְדַלִּיק נֵרוֹת וְהָדֵר מִקְטֹר קַטֹּרֶת שֶׁל בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים! וְכִי תִימָא הֵי נָמִי – וְהִתְנַיָּא: “מִמָּעֹב עַד בִּקְר” –

It means: **At the time of the removal of the ashes you shall burn the incense, and no later.** As, if you do not say so but explain that the phrase: He shall burn the incense, at the end of the verse means after cleaning the lamps, then with regard to the burning of the **afternoon** incense, with regard to which it is written: “**And when Aaron lights the lamps in the afternoon he shall burn it**” (Exodus 30:8), in this case too, does it mean that initially the priest lights the lamps and only then burns the afternoon incense? **And if you say indeed, that is so, wasn't the following taught in a baraita with regard to the verse:** “Aaron and his sons will set it in order to burn from evening until morning before the Lord; it shall be a statute forever throughout their generations on behalf of the children of Israel” (Exodus 27:21)?