His arm…could assist him – could assist him…

The mishna states: On every other day, the coal pan was heavy, but on this day it was light. It was taught in a baraita: On every other day its side was thick but on this day it was soft and thin. On every other day its handle was short but on this day it was long. What is the reason? So that the arm of the High Priest could assist him in carrying the coal pan, i.e., he could support the coal pan by resting it against his arm rather than bear the entire weight in his hand.

It was taught in a baraita: On every other day it did not have a ring, but on this day it has a ring on the end of the handle, which clatters against it and makes a noise in fulfillment of the verse “And the sound thereof shall be heard when he goes in to the Sanctuary” (Exodus 28:35); this is the statement of the son of the Deputy.

But on this day it was soft and thin – because when the coal pan used on Yom Kippur had a longer handle, had it not been made of thinner material it would have been heavier than the coal pan used throughout the year (Siah Yitzhak).

The mishna states: On every other day, the gold was of Ophir but on this day it was of a red gold. Rav Hisda said: There are seven types of gold mentioned in the Bible: Gold, and good gold, and gold of Ophir (1 Kings 10:11), and glistering gold (1 Kings 10:18), and shahut gold (1 Kings 10:17), and closed gold (1 Kings 10:21), and parveyim gold (1 Chronicles 3:6). The Gemara explains the reason for these names: There is a distinction between gold and good gold, as it is written in the verse: “And the gold of that land is good” (Genesis 2:12), which indicates the existence of gold of a higher quality. Gold of Ophir is gold that comes from Ophir. Glistering [muftaj] gold is so named.

Because it resembles the luster of pearls [paz].

Talmud explains that it looks like the luster of pearls. The Jerusalem Talmud explains that it looks like the flame of a burning splint. According to another interpretation, mofar is an abbreviation of zahav mofar, meaning gold from a place called Ofar.

Resembles the luster of pearls. Rashi explains the reference is to the luster of pearls. The Jerusalem Talmud explains that it looks like the flame of a burning splint. According to another interpretation, mofar is an abbreviation of zahav mofar, meaning gold from a place called Ofar.

Types of gold – red gold. Pure gold has a dark yellow color and is soft and malleable. For practical purposes, such as the fashioning of vessels and the like, silver, bronze, and other substances must be added to create harder alloys. Even the addition of a small amount of a secondary metal has a great effect on the color and physical attributes of the gold, giving it a range of appearance from silvery white to blood red to bright green.

Rav Ashi said: There are in fact only five types of gold, the last five in Rav Hisda’s list. Gold and good gold are not independent categories; rather, each and every one of the types of gold has two varieties: Regular gold and a superior variety called good gold. That was also taught in a baraita with regard to parveyim gold: On every other day the coal pan was made of greenish gold, but on this day it was made of a red gold, and this is the parveyim gold which resembles the blood of bulls.
The Mishna states: On every other day, a priest sacrificed a pasuk, half of a maneh, of incense in the morning, and a pasuk in the afternoon, but on this day the High Priest adds an additional handful of incense and burns it in the Holy of Holies. On every other day, the incense was ground fine as prescribed by the Torah, but on this day it was superfine. The Sages taught in a baraita: The verse states with regard to the incense on Yom Kippur that it is "finely ground aromatic incense" (Leviticus 16:12). What does the verse mean to teach this? Has it not already been stated: “And you shall grind some of it finely” (Exodus 30:36)? Rather, it teaches that on Yom Kippur the incense has to be superfine.

The mishna states: On every other day, priests ascend on the eastern side of the ramp. A baraita explains the reason for this: As the Master said: All the turns that you turn should be only to the right, which, after ascending the altar, means one will turn to the east and will mean one will circulate the altar in a counter-clockwise fashion. When they descended, they again turned to the right, which is to the west of the ramp.  

The mishna states: On every other day, there were four arrangements of wood there, upon the altar, but on this day there were five. The Sages taught in the Tosafot: On every other day there were two arrangements of wood on the altar, but on this day there were three: One, the large arrangement; and one, the second arrangement for coals for the incense; and one, the additional arrangement of wood, which they add on that day for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

Rabbi Yosef says: On every other day there were three arrangements, but on this day there were four: One, the large arrangement; and one, the second arrangement for the incense; and one, for the upkeep of the fire; so that if the fire of the large arrangement begins to die down, wood from this arrangement may be added to it to raise the flames; and one, the additional arrangement of wood that they add on that day for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies.

Rabbi Meir says: On every other day there were four arrangements of wood on the altar but on this day there were five: One, the large arrangement; and one, the second arrangement for the incense; and one, for the upkeep of the fire; and one, for burning the limbs and fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening; and one, the additional arrangement of wood that they add on that day for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies.

The Gemara analyzes the different opinions: At any rate, everyone has at least two arrangements in their calculations. From where do we derive this? The verse states: "It is the burnt-offering on the flame on the altar all night” (Leviticus 6:2); this is referring to the large arrangement. It states further: “And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Leviticus 6:2), this additional mention of a fire is referring to the second arrangement, which is for the incense. And from where does Rabbi Yosef learn about the additional arrangement for the upkeep of the fire? He derives it from the verse: “And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Leviticus 6:3), which mentions fire for the third time.

Notes:

The priests ascend in the middle of the ramp – על linker היכנות. The present text of the Gemara states: They ascend, which implies more than one person ascended the ramp, even on Yom Kippur. This is a reference to the two additional priests, the deputy High Priest and the head of the patrilineal family, who would accompany the High Priest and assist him with various tasks. Since their presence was only for the sake of the High Priest, it was befitting that, on account of his eminence, they too were afforded the privilege of ascending in the middle of the ramp (Tosafot YeShanim; Men‘a‘). One for the upkeep of the fire – איסף לא יועם. Some interpret the word kyyum as referring to the maintenance of the fire on the large arrangement. If it began to die down, wood was added to it from this arrangement (Rashi; Rabbi ElYakim; Men‘a‘). Others interpret the word kyyum as referring to the very existence of fire, i.e., it was made to fulfill the requirement of having a fire constantly burning upon the altar (Rambam; Men‘a‘).
And how does Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that normally there are only two arrangements, explain this third mention of a fire? That additional mention comes to teach about the kindling of the thin wood chips," which were used to ignite the fires on the altar, as it was taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yehuda would say: From where is it derived that the kindling of the wood chips should be done only at the top of the altar, rather than setting them alight at the bottom of the altar and carrying them up? *The verse states*: "And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning thereby" (Leviticus 6:5). And from where does Rabbi Yosei derive that the kindling of the wood chips should be at the top of the altar? He derives it from the same place that Rabbi Shimon derives it. As it was taught in a *baraita*: The verse states: "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar" (Leviticus 1:7), which indicates that the fire that is brought there has to be lit on the altar itself. Rabbi Yosei said: From where it is derived that an arrangement for the upkeep of the fire is made? *The verse states*: "And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning thereby" (Leviticus 6:5).

And what would Rabbi Yehuda respond to Rabbi Shimon’s reasoning? If this *halakha* was derived from there, I would have said a non-priest could light the fire on the altar by standing on the ground below and using a bellows to fan the flames on the top of the altar. Therefore, this verse teaches us that in all circumstances the person kindling the fire must be a priest.

And from where does Rabbi Meir learn about an additional arrangement for the limbs and the fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening? He derives it from the phrase "and the fire." The apparently superfluous word "and" alludes to the existence of an additional arrangement. *And the Rabbis, i.e.,* Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Yehuda, who disagree, do not expound the word "and."*And*

And according to the Rabbis, what do they do with the limbs and the fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening? Where are they burned? A priest returns them to the large arrangement, where the process of their burning is completed. As it was taught in a *baraita*: From where is it derived that for limbs and fats that were not fully consumed on the altar the previous evening,
Incense that fell off the altar – תְּהֵא בְּסָמוּךְ

Incense that falls off the altar is not returned to it, even whole pieces that were not burned (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temdin U Musafin 3:2).

Fire for lighting the candelabrum – מִנַּיִין

The Rambam rules that if the westernmost lamp of the candelabrum goes out, it is lit only from the fire of the outer altar. The other lamps, however, are lit from each other. The RavAvad challenges and rejects this approach. He claims that there is no distinction between the westernmost lamp and the other lamps that are lit as long as there is a single lamp burning in the candelabrum, the other lamps may be lit from it. Otherwise, fire is taken from the outer altar (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temdin U Musafin 3:13, and in the comments of Kesez Mishine ve Lehem Mishne).

An arrangement for the incense – מְנוֹרָה

A second arrangement of wood from which coals were taken for the incense sat next to the large arrangement on the outer altar (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temdin U Musafin 3:2).

Explain the phrase "and the fire goes up" – וְאָלוּף הַמִּנְה

The combination of the letters var and het cannot be explained as merely a conjunction without further significance. The var must therefore teach that something additional should be expounded.

A perpetual fire shall be kept burning – וְתֵבִין

Several commentators point out that this verse is used elsewhere for a different derivation. They suggest that this halakha is actually derived from the verse "And the fire upon the altar shall be kept burning" (Leviticus 6:6), and this is indeed how the Sifrei derives the halakha (Gvat Shaul).

From where is derived fire with the coal pan – וְכִלָּה

The additional fire for the incense coal pan is derived from the phrase "And the fire," which is referring to the outer altar. However, since the verse also teaches that there is an additional special arrangement for a particular day, i.e., Yom Kippur, it makes sense that that arrangement could be located in a different place. Therefore, another derivation is required to teach otherwise (Tosefta Halakha).

Fire is stated – אֵשׁ

The Gemara derivation that the fire used both for the coal pan on the Yom Kippur incense offering and for the candelabrum must come from the outer altar is apparently based on the common use of the word fire in relation to those vessels and in relation to the daily incense offering. However, this is problematic. While the word fire does explicitly appear with regard to the coals taken for the Yom Kippur incense offering (see Leviticus 16:2), it does not appear either with regard to the daily incense offering or with regard to the candelabrum. Rashi therefore explains that the Gemara does not mean to expound from the actual word fire but from the obvious fact that fire was required in all three contexts.

And how does Rabbi Meir expound this verse? He derives from it that if parts of a burnt-offering that were already partially consumed on the altar fell off the altar, you should return them to continue burning, but you do not return incense that was consumed and fell off of the inner incense altar. As Rabbi Hananya bar Minyomi from the school of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov taught in a baraita: The verse states: "That which the fire will consume of the burnt-offering on the altar" (Leviticus 6:5). This teaches that if parts of a burnt-offering that were partially consumed fell off the altar, you should return them, but you do not return incense that was partially consumed and fell off the altar."

At any rate, everyone assumes there is an additional arrangement of wood that they add on that day, i.e., Yom Kippur, for the incense that is burned in the Holy of Holies. From where do they derive this? They derive it from the verse "And the fire upon the altar" (Leviticus 6:5). The apparently superfluous words "and the" allude to an additional fire. And even one who does not generally expound the word "and" does expound the phrase and the."
The offerings brought upon the inner altar are always burned entirely, and therefore this altar may be described as entirely for God. In contrast, offerings brought on the outer altar are sometimes eaten by the priesthood and those who brought the offerings. This altar is therefore only partially for God (Rabbi Elyakim).

Since there are two equally logical derivations, a verse is required to teach the halakha. The verse states: “And he shall take a pan full of coals of fire from upon the altar from before the Lord” (Leviticus 16:12). The description of the altar being “from before God” suggests it is not entirely before the Lord. Which altar is only partially before the Lord, but not all of it is before the Lord, i.e., part of it lies directly parallel to the Sanctuary, but part of it does not? You must say that this is the outer altar. Only the western side of it lies parallel to the entrance to the Sanctuary. In contrast, the inner altar is entirely within the Sanctuary and so is considered entirely before the Lord.

And it is necessary to write “from upon the altar” and it is necessary to write “from before God” because if the Merciful One had written only “from upon the altar” I would have said: What altar is the verse referring to? The inner altar. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “from before God.” And if the Merciful One had written only “from before God,” I would have said it means specifically from the part of the altar that lies before God, i.e., from the northwestern corner, which lies directly parallel to the entrance of the Sanctuary.

Bar Kappara’s statement concerning the Shabbat is actually an independent, novel ruling beyond the first ruling, as indicated by the inclusion of the word “and.” The novelty of the first ruling relates to the status of offerings that are initially invalid, as the Gemara continues to explain. The second ruling, however, provides an additional novel element to the laws of Shabbat: Burning even invalid offerings may override Shabbat (Ezkal Hal Rules).