

הרהורי עבירה קשו מעבירה, וסימנין:  
ריחא דבישרא. שיליה דקייטא קשיא  
מקייטא, וסימנין: תנורא שגירא.

אישתא דסיתורא קשיא מדקייטא,  
וסימנין: תנורא קרירא. מיגמר  
בעתיקתא קשיא מחדתא, וסימנין:  
טינא בר טינא.

אמר רבי אבהו: מאי טעמא דרבי -  
דכתב: "למנצח על אילת השחר" מה  
אילה זו קרניה מפצילות לבאן ולבאן -  
אף שחר זה מפציע לבאן ולבאן.

אמר רבי זירא: למה נמשלה אסתר  
לאילה - לומר לך: מה אילה רחמה  
צר, ורחביבה על בעלה כל שעה ושעה  
כשעה ראשונה - אף אסתר היתה  
רחביבה על אחשוורוש כל שעה ושעה  
כשעה ראשונה. אמר רבי אסי: למה  
נמשלה אסתר לשחר? לומר לך: מה  
שחר סוף כל הלילה - אף אסתר סוף  
כל הנסים.

והא איבא חנוכה! ניתנה לכתוב קא  
אמרינן. הניחא למאן דאמר אסתר  
ניתנה לכתוב, אלא למאן דאמר אסתר  
לא ניתנה לכתוב מאי איבא למימר?

מוקים לה כרבי בנימין בר יפת אמר רבי  
אלעזר. דאמר רבי בנימין בר יפת אמר  
רבי אלעזר: למה נמשלו תפלתן של  
צדיקים כאילת - לומר לך: מה אילה  
זו, כל זמן שפגדלת קרניה מפצילות,  
אף צדיקים - כל זמן שמרבין בתפלה  
תפלתן נשמעת.

Thoughts of transgression are worse than transgression<sup>N</sup> itself, and your mnemonic is the odor of meat. The smell of roasting meat is more appetizing than actually eating the meat. The heat of the end of summer is more oppressive than the heat of the summer itself, and your mnemonic is a heated oven. After an oven has been heated several times in the course of a day, lighting it again, even slightly, will produce powerful heat. So too, at the end of the summer, since everything is hot, the heat is more oppressive.

A fever in the winter is more powerful than a fever in the summer, and your mnemonic is a cold oven. Heating a cold oven requires greater heat than heating a hot oven. A fever that succeeds in raising the body temperature in the winter must be more powerful than a fever that raises the body temperature in the summer. Relearning old material that was known and forgotten is more difficult than learning from new material. And your mnemonic is mixing mortar from mortar.<sup>N</sup> It is harder to take hardened mortar, crush it, and mix new mortar than it is to simply mix new mortar.

Apropos moonlight and sunlight discussed previously, Rabbi Abbahu said: What is the rationale for the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi<sup>N</sup> that sunlight diffuses and in that sense is dissimilar to moonlight? It is as it is written: "For the leader, about the morning hind" (Psalms 22:1); just as the antlers of a hind<sup>B</sup> branch out to here and to there, so too, the light of dawn diffuses to here and to there.

In tractate *Megilla*, the Gemara states that Queen Esther prophetically recited this Psalm in reference to her situation as she was about to come before King Ahasuerus without being summoned. Rabbi Zeira said: Why is Esther likened to a hind? It is to tell you: Just as in the case of a hind its womb is narrow and it is desirable to its mate at each and every hour like it is at the first hour, so too, Esther was desirable to Ahasuerus at each and every hour like she was at the first hour. Rabbi Asi said: Why was Esther likened to the dawn? It is to tell you: Just as the dawn is the conclusion of the entire night, so too, Esther was the conclusion of all miracles performed for the entire Jewish people.

The Gemara asks: But isn't there the miracle of Hanukkah, which was performed many years later? The Gemara answers: It is true that additional miracles were performed after the miracle of Purim; however, it is with regard to miracles for which permission was granted to write them in the Bible that we are saying that the miracle of Purim was the last one. The Gemara asks: That works out well according to the one who said: Permission was granted to write the Scroll of Esther in the Bible as a book whose sanctity equals that of the other books of the Bible. However, according to the one who said: Permission was not granted to write the Scroll of Esther in the Bible, and its sanctity does not reach the level of the other books of the Bible, what can be said?

The Gemara answers: Actually, Purim was not the conclusion of all miracles performed for the entire Jewish people, and the one who holds that permission was not granted for the Scroll of Esther to be written establishes the analogy between Esther and the hind in accordance with the statement that Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet said that Rabbi Elazar said; as Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet said that Rabbi Elazar said: Why are the prayers of the righteous likened to a hind? It is to tell you: Just as with regard to a hind, as long as it grows its antlers they continue to branch out; so too, with regard to the righteous, as long as they engage more in prayer their prayer is heard.

NOTES

Thoughts of transgression are worse than transgression - הרהורי עבירה קשו מעבירה: Unspecified transgression in the Talmud refers to licentiousness, and thoughts about transgression refers to thoughts of that sort. Rashi and the Rid explain that the reference here is not to the relative severity of thought versus action; rather, it means that the degree of stimulation in anticipating this transgression is greater than it is during its actual performance. Other commentaries explain that the reference is in fact to the relative severity of thought versus action. Some contend that because thoughts of transgression transpire in the mind, the damage that they cause is greater than the damage caused by actually engaging in sin, which merely involves the body (Rambam's Guide for the Perplexed). Some commentaries say that thoughts of transgression are more available and therefore more common than the transgression itself, and therefore they cause greater damage (*Be'er Mayim Hayyim*). Another explanation is that after actually performing the transgression the transgressor's desire is satisfied, and therefore he might be open to repentance; however, thoughts of transgression provide no such satisfaction and therefore repentance is less likely (*Or HaHayyim*). Yet another explanation cites the general distinction between transgressions committed intentionally and those committed unwittingly to underscore the significance of one's thoughts in determining the severity of a transgression (*Ben Yehoyada*).

Mortar from mortar - טינא בר טינא: Some commentaries explain that it is difficult to mix earth that was kneaded into mortar with unkneaded earth. Similarly, it is difficult to integrate knowledge that was forgotten with knowledge that one remembers well (*geonim*).

What is the rationale for the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi - מאי טעמא דרבי: Many commentaries point out that raising this question with regard to facts is rare, as facts can be ascertained through observation. Some explain that support was sought for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi from a verse because the matter is subject to dispute in the *Tosefta* (Rabbi Elazar Moshe Horowitz). Others explain that the Gemara is asking: What is the novelty in the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and what can be learned from it? The novelty is in the interpretation of the verses of the Psalm with regard to the morning hind, and why it is interpreted as referring to dawn (Mahari Pik).

BACKGROUND

Antlers of a hind - קרני אילה: The antlers of deer, typically males, branch out into different segments. Deer typically shed their antlers each year, and when the antlers grow back they include an additional segment.



Red deer stag with newly forming antlers during the spring

NOTES

Is there no alternative to having the service performed by the High Priest – לא סניא דלאו בהן גדול? Although it is possible that the High Priest was involved in this incident, if there is no significance to his participation, there would be no point to mentioning it (Ritva).

On Yom Kippur – ביום הכפורים: According to Rambam, this error occurred twice; once during the second half of the month, when they were confused by the moonlight because then the moon rises in the east, and once on Yom Kippur for a different reason.

BACKGROUND

The moon on Yom Kippur – ירח ביום הכפורים: There is no fixed time for the rising of the moon; rather, it varies each day of the lunar cycle. During the first half of the month the moon rises in the east between the afternoon and dusk, and it can be seen in the west in the morning. In the latter part of the month the moon rises in the east at the end of the night. Therefore, it would have been impossible for them to have seen the moon rising in the east on the morning of Yom Kippur.

”שחטו את התמיד.” אימת? אילימא בשאר ימות השנה – לא סניא דלאו בהן גדול? אלא ביום הכפורים – מאור הלבנה מי איכא?

הכי קאמר: וביום הכפורים, כי אָמַר “בְּרַק בְּרַקְאֵי” הוֹרִידוּ בְּהֵן גְּדוּל לְבֵית הַטְּבִילָה.

תני אבוי דרבי אבין: לא זו בלבד אָמַרו, אָלָא אַף מְלִיקַת הָעוֹף וקְמִיצַת מִנְחָה בַּלַּיְלָה תִּשְׂרַף. בְּשִׁלְמָא עוֹלַת הָעוֹף – מֵאֵי דִּהוּהָ הָיָה, אָלָא קוּמָץ.

**S** The mishna relates that as a result of the confusion, they slaughtered the daily offering before dawn. The Gemara asks: **When did this incident occur? If we say it occurred during the rest of the days of the year, is there no alternative to having the service performed by the High Priest?**<sup>N</sup> The mishna states that after slaughtering the daily offering, they led the High Priest down to the Hall of Immersion. On all the other days of the year, the High Priest need not perform the service and it may be performed by a common priest. **Rather**, it must be that this incident occurred **on Yom Kippur**,<sup>N</sup> when the service is performed exclusively by the High Priest. However, in that case, **is there moonlight?**<sup>B</sup> According to the lunar cycle, the moon never rises in the east adjacent to dawn on Yom Kippur.

The Gemara answers that **this is what the mishna is saying**: The incident occurred during the rest of the year, at which point they instituted that the appointed priest announce the arrival of dawn in the Temple. **And on Yom Kippur, when the appointed priest said: The light flashed, they immediately led the High Priest down to the Hall of Immersion.**

Apropos this fundamental *halakha*, the father of Rabbi Avin taught a *baraita*: **Not only this**, that a daily offering slaughtered before dawn is disqualified and burned, **did they say; rather, even in the case of the pinching of the neck of a bird and the taking of the handful of a meal-offering that are performed at night**, these items must be burned. The Gemara analyzes the *baraita*: **Granted, a bird sacrificed as a burnt-offering is disqualified if pinched before dawn; what was, was.** The situation can no longer be remedied, and the bird must be burned. **However, why should the handful of a meal-offering be burned?**

Perek III  
Daf 29 Amud b

NOTES

Both during the day and at night – בין ביום ובין בלילה: Many variant readings of the Talmud omit this passage. Indeed, according to some commentaries, the phrase: Items sacrificed at night, refers to the oil of the candelabrum, which is kindled at night and is consecrated only at night. Items that are sacrificed both during the day and at night include meal offerings or libations that are sacrificed independently of their offerings and which may be consecrated and sacrificed at any time (*Me'iri*).

Sufficiently consecrated to be disqualified – קדוש ליפסל: There are several aspects to the sanctity that takes effect on an object in the Temple. There is a positive aspect of the sanctity in that the animal, meal-offering, or libation is consecrated to God and may be sacrificed on the altar. The consecrated status of these objects also means that they are subject even to fourth-degree ritual impurity. They can become impure through contact with individuals lacking atonement whose purification process is not yet complete, and they are disqualified if taken out of the confines of the sacred area. This second form of sanctity is sanctity sufficient to be disqualified, unrelated to the positive sanctity that takes effect on the same item.

נהדרה, ונהדר ונקמצה ביממא! הוא תני לה והוא אמר לה: כלי שרת מקדשין אפילו שלא בזמנו.

מיתבי, זה הכלל: כל הקרב ביום – קדוש ביום, וכל הקרב בלילה – קדוש בלילה, וכל הקרב בין ביום ובין בלילה – קדוש בין ביום ובין בלילה. קתני מיהת: כל הקרב ביום – קדוש ביום; ביום – אין, בלילה – לא! דילמא אינו קדוש ליקרב, אבל קדוש ליפסל.

**Let us restore the handful that was removed from the meal-offering at night, and let us again take a handful during the day.** Why must the meal-offering be burned? The Gemara explains: **He taught the baraita that he received through tradition, and he said its explanation. Service vessels, which are sacred, consecrate their contents even when those contents are not placed in the vessel at the appointed time for that service.** Once the handful is placed in the sacred vessel, the sanctity of the handful immediately takes effect and the situation can no longer be remedied.

The Gemara **raises an objection** from that which was taught in a *baraita*. **This is the principle: Any offering that is sacrificed during the day is consecrated by being sacrificed during the day; and any offering that is sacrificed at night is consecrated only at night; and any offering that is sacrificed both during the day and at night is consecrated both during the day and at night.**<sup>N</sup> **In any case, it is teaching that any offering that is sacrificed during the day is consecrated during the day.** One learns by inference: **During the day, yes, it is consecrated; at night, no, it is not consecrated.** Apparently, the handful of the meal-offering is not consecrated before dawn, which poses a difficulty to the explanation of Rabbi Avin's father. The Gemara answers: **Perhaps the inference from the baraita means that when it is not sacrificed at its appointed time it is not sufficiently consecrated to be sacrificed on the altar; however, it is sufficiently consecrated to be disqualified.**<sup>N</sup>



**לֶחֶם שֶׁסִּדֵּר – אַחֵר הַשַּׁבָּת**  
 Bread that was arranged after Shabbat – **לֶחֶם שֶׁסִּדֵּר** – **אַחֵר הַשַּׁבָּת**: Both the shewbread and the accompanying vessels of frankincense that were placed on the table after Shabbat should be left on the table until the next week, at which point the incense should be burned (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Temidin UMusafin* 5:13).

BACKGROUND

**Monkey – קוף**: Monkeys and apes are the most intelligent animals. Unlike apes, monkeys usually have tails. It seems that the default reference to a monkey in the Talmud refers to one of the tailed species, especially baboons, since these were often reared in ancient times.



Olive baboon

מְתִיב רַבִּי זְוֵרָא: סִידֵּר אֶת הַלֶּחֶם וְאֶת הַבְּזִיכִין אַחֵר הַשַּׁבָּת, וְהִקְטִיר אֶת הַבְּזִיכִין בַּשַּׁבָּת – פְּסוּלָה.

Rabbi Zeira raised an objection to the principle of the father of Rabbi Avin based on what was taught in a mishna: If a priest arranged the bread and the vessels of frankincense that accompany the shewbread on the golden table after Shabbat,<sup>H</sup> on Sunday instead of on Shabbat, then even though he burned the frankincense that was in the vessels on Shabbat, they are disqualified.<sup>N</sup> That is because the bread was not arranged at its appointed time and therefore will not be arranged on the table for the requisite seven days.

בִּיצֵד יַעֲשֶׂה? וַיִּנְחַנו לַשַּׁבָּת הַבָּאָה, שְׂאֵפִילוּ עִמָּדָה עַל הַשְּׁלַחַן יָמִים רַבִּים אִין בְּכֹךְ פְּלוּם, וְאִמְאִי? תִּקְדֹּשׁ וְתִפְסֹל!

**How shall he proceed** to prevent its disqualification? **He should not** remove it, but rather he should leave the shewbread on the table to be removed the following Shabbat, as even if the bread remained on the table for many days, that does not matter. Then, on the following Shabbat, he arranges and places the shewbread in the appropriate manner. **And** according to the opinion of the father of Rabbi Avin, **why** is this remedy effective? If service vessels consecrate their contents even when those contents are not placed there at the appointed time, once the bread was placed on the table after Shabbat it is consecrated and disqualified.

אָמַר רַבָּא: מֵאֵן דְּקָא מוֹתֵיב – שְׂפִיר קָא מוֹתֵיב. וְאָבוּהֵּ דְרַבִּי אֲבִין נָמִי – מִתְּנִיתָא קְאָמַר, וְקִסְבְּר: לַיְלָה – אִין מְחוּסַר זְמַן, יוֹם – מְחוּסַר זְמַן.

Rava said: Rabbi Zeira, who raises the objection, raises the objection well. **And the father of Rabbi Avin is also stating a baraita.** Therefore, his opinion cannot be dismissed. At the same time, the contradiction between the *baraita* and the mishna must be resolved. **And the tanna of the baraita maintains:** A service performed at night is not considered premature. If there is a requirement to perform a certain action during the day but one performed it the night before, it is not considered as though he did not perform it at its appointed time, because the day and the night before it are considered a single unit. Therefore, placing the shewbread on the table before dawn disqualifies it. However, a service performed a day earlier is considered premature. Therefore, the table does not consecrate shewbread placed on it a day before Shabbat, and all the more so a week before Shabbat.

כִּי מָטִי בִי שְׂמֵשִׁי תִּקְדֹּשׁ וְתִפְסֹל! אָמַר רַבִּינָא: שְׂקֵדָם וְסִלְקוּ. מָר זֹוּטְרָא, וְאִיתְמַתָּא רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: אֵפִילוּ תִּמְנָא בְּשִׁלָּא קֵדָם וְסִלְקוּ, בִּיּוֹן שְׂסִדְרוּ שְׁלָא בְּמַצּוֹתוֹ – נַעֲשֶׂה כְּמוֹ שְׂסִדְרוּ הַקּוּף.

If a service performed at night is not considered premature, **when Shabbat evening** arrives, the arrangement of bread remaining on the table should be consecrated and disqualified when morning comes, because it was arranged at night. **Ravina said:** It is referring to a case where one removed the shewbread from the table before nightfall on Friday night to prevent consecration and disqualification. **Mar Zutra, and some say Rav Ashi, said:** Even if you say that one did not remove the shewbread before nightfall, since he arranged the shewbread not in accordance with the procedure dictated by its mitzva as it was not at its appointed time, its legal status becomes as if a monkey<sup>B</sup> arranged the shewbread.<sup>N</sup> At dawn, the priest will remove it from the table and replace it in accordance with the procedure dictated by its mitzva. However, with regard to a meal-offering whose handful was placed into a sacred vessel and shewbread that was placed on the table before dawn, they are not considered premature. They are therefore consecrated and disqualified.

זֶה הַכֶּלֶל הִיָּה בִּמְקַדְּשׁ. בְּשִׁלְמָא רְגִלִים – מְשׁוּם נִיּוּצוֹת, אֶלָּא יָדַיִם? מֵאִי טַעְמָא? אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא: זֹאת אוֹמֶרֶת

The mishna continues: **This was the principle in the Temple:** Anyone who covers his legs, a euphemism for defecating, must immerse afterward; and anyone who urinates requires sanctification of the hands and feet with water from the basin afterward. The Gemara asks: **Granted,** one who urinates is required to sanctify his feet, due to drops of urine that drip on his feet. **However,** with regard to his hands, **what is the reason** that he is required to sanctify them? His hands did not come into contact with anything filthy. **Rabbi Abba said:** That is to say that one learns appropriate conduct from this, namely that

NOTES

**סִידֵּר אֶת – He arranged the bread...** they are disqualified – In a note on Rashi's commentary, apparently by one of his disciples or Rabbeinu Tam, this *halakha* is expunged because the shewbread can still be salvaged, and it is not disqualified when placed at an inappropriate time. However, some commentaries write that disqualified here does not refer to

the bread but to the frankincense in the vessels accompanying the bread. Once this incense is burned before its time, it is completely disqualified (*Tosafot Yeshanim; Tosafot HaRosh*).

**כְּמוֹ שְׂסִדְרוּ הַקּוּף – As if a monkey arranged the shewbread –** The Gemara is explained as follows: If the arrangement of the

shewbread was placed intentionally at an inappropriate time, the placement is significant, and the bread is consecrated and disqualified. However, since when the point of disqualification, Shabbat evening, arrives, the bread was arranged on the table, its status is as if it appeared there on its own rather than being placed there by the priest (Ritva).