Ravina said to Rav Ashi with regard to the basis for Abaye’s argument: Is this term: In the morning, in the morning, written with regard to the two logs actually superfluous and therefore available to have other matters derived from it? Isn’t it necessary to teach its own basic halakha, as the Merciful One states in the Torah: Have it precede the second arrangement of wood, from which coals are taken for the incense? Rav Ashi said to him: And did we not establish that it is written: Upon it, underscoring the fact that wood is placed only on the large arrangement and not on the other arrangement from which coals are taken for the incense? From the fact that this exclusionary term is necessary, it can be derived by inference that there is another pile on the altar, meaning that when the new logs are placed on the altar, the two arrangements are already there.

The Gemara asks with regard to the sequence in which the priest removes the ashes from the lamps: What is different that he performs the removal of ashes from five lamps first? Let us perform the removal of ashes from two lamps first. The Gemara answers: Since he begins the service with them, he performs the service on a majority of the lamps. The Gemara asks: If so, let him perform the service on six lamps. The Gemara responds that the verse states: “When he removes the ashes from the lamps, he shall burn it” (Exodus 30:7), and lamps is plural, meaning no fewer than two. Apparently, removal of ashes from lamps must be performed on a minimum of two lamps.

Abaye continued: And the removal of ashes from two lamps precedes the burning of the incense, as the verse first states: “When he removes the ashes from the lamps,” and then states: “He shall burn it.” The removal of the ashes precedes the burning of the incense.

Abaye continued: And the burning of the incense on the inner altar precedes the burning of the limbs of the daily offering on the outer altar, as it was taught in a baraita: Let the matter with regard to which it is stated: In the morning, in the morning, i.e., the burning of the incense, precede the matter with regard to which only one: In the morning, is stated, i.e., the daily morning offering, in the verse: “You shall offer one lamb in the morning” (Exodus 29:39).

Abaye continued: The burning of the limbs precedes the sacrifice of the meal-offering that accompanies the daily offering, as it was taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that there may be no item placed on the arrangement of wood prior to the daily morning offering?

The verse states: “And the priest shall burn wood upon it in the morning, in the morning, and he shall place the burnt-offering upon it” (Leviticus 6:5), and Rava said: The verse could have simply said: And he shall place upon it, indicating that everything sacrificed on the altar is placed upon it; but instead, the verse states: “And he shall place the burnt-offering upon it,” to teach that it ascends the altar first."

Abaye continued: The sacrifice of the meal-offering precedes the sacrifice of the High Priest’s daily griddle-cake offering, half of which he sacrifices in the morning and half in the afternoon, as the verse states: “To bring offerings by fire to the Lord, burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, sacrifices, and libations, on each day what is proper to it” (Leviticus 23:37). Since the Torah states burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, apparently the daily burnt-offering precedes the meal-offering. And since the meal-offering is part of the burnt-offering sacrifice, it precedes the griddle-cake offering, which is a meal-offering unrelated to the burnt-offering.

The burnt-offering, it ascends the altar first – הָעֹלָה הָאָרֶץ אֲדֹנָי. Rabbeinu Hananel explains that this is derived from the term: The burnt-offering, with the definite article. This teaches that the offering is the known burnt-offering that is sacrificed first. From his explanation, as well as that of Rashi, it is necessary to derive only that the burnt-offering precedes other offerings, not specifically that this burnt-offering is the daily morning offering. That is obvious, as the daily offering is the burnt-offering that is a fixed component of the daily service (see Tosafot).

The burnt-offering, it ascends the altar first – הָעֹלָה הָאָרֶץ אֲדֹנָי. It is prohibited to sacrifice any offering before the daily morning offering (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusa’in 1:3).
The griddle-cake offering precedes the pouring of the libations; hence it is in the category of meal-offering. Since it has been established that the meal-offering that accompanies the daily offering is sacrificed after the daily offering, all meal-offerings are sacrificed after the daily-offering prior to any other service.

Abaye continued: And the libations precede the sacrifice of the additional offerings, as it is written: Offerings and libations, from which it is derived that the libations are brought immediately after the daily offering, before any other offering is sacrificed. And the additional offerings precede the vessels of frankincense that are brought on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: The vessels of frankincense precede the additional offerings? The Gemara answers: This is the subject of a dispute between the tanna’im Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva (Pesahim 58a).

Abaye said: It is reasonable that the sequence should be in accordance with the opinion of the one who said the additional offerings precede the vessels of frankincense, as didn’t you say that the repetition of the term: In the morning, in the morning, comes to prioritize the daily offering? Here too, repetition within the clause: “He shall arrange them on Shabbat day, on Shabbat day” (Leviticus 24:8), with regard to the vessels of frankincense, comes to postpone that service until the peak of the day.

The Gemara asks: What is the rationale for the opinion of the one who said: The vessels of frankincense precede the additional offerings? The Gemara explains: By means of a verbal analogy he derives: Statute, written with regard to the vessels of frankincense: “A statute for all time” (Leviticus 24:9), from: Statute, written with regard to the griddle-cake offering: “A statute for all time” (Leviticus 6:15). Just as the griddle-cake offering precedes the additional offerings, so too, the vessels of frankincense precede the additional offerings.

The Gemara asks: If he derived it from there, let him derive the entire matter from there, and let the vessels of frankincense be burned immediately after the griddle-cake offering; why are the libations offered between them? The Gemara answers: It is to that end that the verse: “He shall arrange them on Shabbat day, on Shabbat day,” with regard to the vessels of frankincense, is effective, to postpone their offering until later. §

After analyzing Abaye’s tradition with regard to the sequence of the daily service, the Gemara returns to analyzing the passage in the mishna: The morning incense was burned between the receiving and sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the limbs. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is the mishna? If it is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis elsewhere (15a), the mishna should say that the incense was burned between the sprinkling of the blood and the removal of the ashes from the lamps. If it is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, the mishna should say that the incense was burned between the removal of the ashes from the lamps and the burning of the limbs.

The Gemara responds: Actually, the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, but the mishna is not speaking of the sequence of the entire service. The mishna states that the incense was burned between the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the limbs of the daily offering, although other services were performed then as well, including the removal of ashes from the lamps.

The mishna continues: The afternoon incense was burned between the taking of the limbs up to the altar and the pouring of its libations. The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Yoḥanan said that the verse states: And the other lamb you shall present in the afternoon, as the meal-offering in the morning and its libation, you shall present it, an offering made by fire, of a sweet fragrance unto the Lord” (Numbers 28:8). Just as with regard to the morning meal-offering incense precedes libations, so too here, in the afternoon, incense precedes the libations.
The Gemara asks: If so, just as there, in the morning, incense even precedes limbs, so too here, in the afternoon, incense should precede limbs. The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: As the limbs in the morning? As the meal-offering in the morning, is written, indicating with regard to the daily afternoon offering that it is like the meal-offering in the morning, and not like the burning of the limbs of the morning.

The Sages taught in a baraita that it is written: “And its libation shall be a quarter-hin for the one lamb, in the sacred area it shall be poured as an offering of strong drink unto the Lord” (Numbers 28:7). The Sages understand this verse as referring to the daily afternoon offering; therefore, one will derive the manner and order of the daily morning offering from the manner and order of the daily afternoon offering. Just as libations are required for the daily afternoon offering, so too, they are required for the daily morning offering.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The daily afternoon offering is derived from that of the morning. The phrase: “The one lamb,” refers to the lamb of the daily morning offering, and the daily afternoon offering is derived from it.

The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the opinion of the Rabbis who hold that this verse is written with regard to the daily afternoon offering based on the preceding verses, they can explain that the daily morning offering is derived from the daily afternoon offering. However, what is the rationale for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who holds that the afternoon offering is derived from the morning offering? Rabba bar Ulla said that the verse states: “For the one lamb.” Which is the lamb with regard to which it is previously stated: One? You must say: That is the lamb of the daily morning offering (see Exodus 29:39).

And according to the Rabbis, what is the meaning of the term: One? It means the special lamb that is one in his flock. The lamb for the daily offering should be of the highest quality. And from where does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derive that principle? The Gemara answers that in his opinion, the principle is derived from that which is written: “And all the choicest of your vow-offerings” (Deuteronomy 12:11). One is required to fulfill his vow by offering the animal of the highest quality. And how do the Rabbis interpret this verse? They interpret that one verse refers to the requirement to bring the animal of the highest quality for obligatory offerings and one verse refers to the requirement to bring the animal of the highest quality for gift-offerings. And both verses are necessary, as otherwise it would not have been clear that this requirement applies to both. On the one hand, one might think it is only with regard to obligatory offerings that the animal of the highest quality must be sacrificed. On the other hand, one might think it is only with regard to a gift-offering that the animal of the highest quality must be sacrificed, as if it is not of the highest quality, it is better not to sacrifice it at all.

NOTES
One will derive the manner and order of the daily morning offering from the manner and order of the daily afternoon offering. Nearly all of the commentators are troubled by this. Since it is explicitly stated: “And the other lamb you shall present in the afternoon; as the meal-offering of the morning and as its libation, you shall present it” (Numbers 28:8), indicating that libations are poured in the afternoon like in the morning, why is this derivation necessary? Some commentaries explain that the Gemara is not addressing the fundamental obligation to bring libations; rather it is addressing the particulars of the libations, the nature of the wine and the like, which have no other source (Maskil LeEitan). Others explain that the verse: “As the meal-offering of the morning and as its libation” (Exodus 29:43) teaches that there is a libation of oil mixed into the meal-offering. It is not a source for the obligation to pour a libation of wine (Kehillat Yis’akov).

NOTES
The opinions of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis – ששתים ופיים קצבים: Many commentaries ask what the difference is between these two opinions, as it seems that the dispute is merely with regard to the verse from which the fastikhoth is derived. Tosafot cite one difference. Some explain that if one failed to pour the libations from the daily morning or afternoon offering, a libation should not be poured over the other, as one is derived from the other. The dispute concerns which daily offering is derived from the other (Ritva). Alternatively, there might be a difference with regard to whether the water libation brought on the festival of Sukkot is poured together with the morning or with the afternoon libations (Tosafot Yeshanim; Tosafot HaRosh).
Blocks of iron – וליבלו על הברך. If the High Priest was old or sick, they would heat blocks of iron on the eve of Yom Kippur, which they placed in the ritual bath the next day to temper its chill. This was permitted because rabbinic decrees enacted to enhance the character of Shabbat as a day of rest were not in effect in the Temple. See Tosafot whose variant reading is apparently the source for the Rambam’s ruling (Lehman Mishne; Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 2:2).

An unintentional act – הלול הזרע. It is permitted to perform an action on Shabbat despite the fact that it may lead to a prohibited result, provided that there is no intention to achieve the prohibited result (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 337:1).

Circumcision where there is leprosy – ונהל הזרע. The positive mitzva of circumcision overrides the prohibition against cutting off leprosy from the foreskin whether or not the circumcision is performed at its appointed time (Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 266:1).

The mishna continues: If the High Priest was old or delicate, they would heat hot water for him on Yom Kippur eve and place it into the cold water of the ritual bath in order to temper its chill. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: They would heat blocks of iron on Yom Kippur eve and cast them into the cold water of the ritual bath to temper its chill. The Gemara asks: But by doing so, doesn’t he harden the iron, which is a labor prohibited on Yom Kippur? Rav Beivai said: The temperature of the blocks of iron did not reach the hardening point. Abaye said: Even if you say that the temperature of the iron reached the hardening point, the fact that the iron hardened when he placed it in the water is an unintentional act, which is permitted. His intention was to temper the chill of the water, not to harden the iron.

And did Abaye actually say that an unintentional act is permitted? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita that it is written: “And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Leviticus 12:3), from which it is derived that one may cut the foreskin and circumcise the baby even if there is a white spot of leprosy there? He may do so even though the Torah prohibits excising a white spot of leprosy. This is the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya. And we discussed this matter: Why do I need a verse to permit it? His intention is not to excise the leprosy but to fulfill the mitzva of circumcision. And Abaye said: The statement of Rabbi Yoshiya is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said that performing an unintentional act is prohibited. Therefore, a special verse is necessary to permit circumcision in that case. Apparently, Abaye holds that Rabbi Yehuda prohibits even unintentional acts. Why, then, does he explain that Rabbi Yehuda permits placing blocks of iron into the water if his intention is not to harden the iron?

The Gemara answers: When Abaye said that Rabbi Yehuda prohibits its unintentional acts, that applies only to actions prohibited by Torah law that appear in the whole Torah in its entirety. However, here, hardening the blocks of iron is not a labor prohibited by Torah law but is prohibited by rabbinic law, as a decree intended to enhance the character of Shabbat as a day of rest. Rabbi Yehuda concedes that unintentional performance of prohibitions by rabbinic law is permitted.

An unintentional act – הלול הזרע. In several areas of halakha, notably with regard to the halakhot of Shabbat, there is discussion of an unintentional act, which is a permitted action that leads inadvertently to a prohibited result. With regard to Shabbat, the Torah prohibited performance of actions when one's intent is to accomplish the objective of the prohibited labor, not merely to perform the action. Therefore, there is good reason to permit an unintentional act. Still, many medieval and later commentators ask: Even Rabbi Shimon, who rules that it is permitted to perform an unintentional act, concedes that when the prohibited result of the permitted action is inevitable the unintentional act is prohibited. How, then, is it permitted to place the blocks of iron in the water? The reasons for leniency in this case are related to the fact that the prohibition is by rabbinic law. These reasons are either that even unintentional acts whose prohibited result is inevitable are permitted if the prohibition is by rabbinic law, or that the act is permitted since it was performed in the Temple and rabbinic decrees are not in effect in the Temple (see Tosafot).

Even if there is a white spot of leprosy there – ונהל הזרע. There is a special halakha with regard to leprosy wherein the Torah warns: “Be very careful with skin afflictions” (Deuteronomy 24:8). This expresses the prohibition of cutting off the leprosy. That is why special permission was required to permit its removal in some circumstances. It is permitted in the case of circumcision due to the principle of a positive mitzva overriding a negative mitzva when performance of the mitzva precludes observance of the prohibition.
**MISHNA**

They brought the High Priest to immerse a second time in the Hall of Parva, which was in the sacred area, the Temple courtyard. They spread a sheet of fine linen between him and the people in the interest of modesty. And he sanctified his hands and his feet and removed his garments. Rabbi Meir says that this was the sequence: He first removed his garments and then he sanctified his hands and his feet. He descended and immersed a second time. He ascended and dried himself. And they immediately brought him the white garments, in which he dressed, and he sanctified his hands and his feet.

In the morning he would wear linen garments from the Egyptian city of Pelusium worth twelve maneh, 1,200 dinars or zuz. These garments were very expensive due to their high quality. And in the afternoon he wore linen garments from India, which were slightly less expensive, worth eight hundred zuz. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: In the morning he would wear garments worth eighteen maneh, and in the afternoon he would wear garments worth twelve maneh. In total, the clothes were worth thirty maneh. These sums for the garments came from the community, and if the High Priest wished to add money to purchase even finer garments, he would add funding of his own.

**HALAKHA**

The garments of the High Priest – בִּגְדֵי כֹּהֵן: The High Priest had two tunics for Yom Kippur, one of which he wore in the morning and the other in the afternoon. Together their value was thirty maneh. If the High Priest wished to contribute his own money to purchase more expensive garments he was permitted to do so as long as he consecrated the addition.

He sanctified his hands and his feet – וְהִנְדוּיִין: The High Priest sanctifies his hands and feet before changing his priestly garments. He washes his hands and feet, removes the garments, immences the new set of clothes, and washes his hands and feet again, as per the opinion of the first tanna in the mishna (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 2:2).

**NOTES**

From Pelusium and from India – בַּשַּׁחַר וְבֵין סָדִין: The first term is apparently a reference to garments of fine linen imported from the city of Pelusium in Egypt, an ancient center of linen production. With regard to garments from India, there was an ancient culture of growing and processing flax there as well. Pelusium was an important city in the eastern extremes of Egypt’s Nile Delta, 30 km to the southeast of the modern Port Said.

Worth eight hundred zuz – בִּגְדֵי פִּילוּסִין: Tosafor ask why the Gemara does not use the term: Eight maneh, as it did with regard to the other sums. They answer that because the word eight (shemona) includes the letters of the word maneh, it would sound strange, so they rendered the sum differently (see also Tosefot Yom Tov). Others explain that this rendering comes to clarify that the reference is not to the special sacred maneh worth more than a hundred dinars, but to a regular maneh (see Siah Yitzhak). Since Rabbi Meir did not mention the total cost of the garments in his statement, as the Rabbis did, apparently he insists on both the total sum as well as on the cost of each of the individual sets of garments (Siah Yitzhak, Yad David).