

His arm... could assist him – וְרָעוּ... מְסִיעֵתוֹ: On every other day of the year, the handle of the coal pan is short. On Yom Kippur it is longer to make the job of carrying the coal pan easier, lest the High Priest overexert himself and become weak (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 3:2).

”בְּכָל יוֹם הָיְתָה כְּבִידָה וְהַיּוֹם קִלָּה.”
תַּנָּא: בְּכָל יוֹם הָיְתָה גְּלוּדָה עֲבָה,
וְהַיּוֹם רַךְ. בְּכָל יוֹם הָיְתָה קְצָרָה וְהַיּוֹם
אָרוּכָה. מֵאֵי טַעְמָא – כְּדֵי שְׂתַתְּיָא
זְרָעוֹ שֶׁל בַּהֲן גְּדוּל מְסִיעֵתוֹ.

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.^N 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^{NH} 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.**

תַּנָּא: בְּכָל יוֹם לֹא הָיָה לָהּ מִיֵּאֲשֵׁתִיק,
וְהַיּוֹם הָיָה לָהּ מִיֵּאֲשֵׁתִיק, דְּבָרֵי בֶן
הַפְּגָן.

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.**

”בְּכָל יוֹם הָיָה זָהָבָה יְרוּקָה.” אָמַר רַב
חִסְדָּא: שִׁבְעָה זָהָבִים הֵן: זָהָב, וְזָהָב
טוֹב, וְזָהָב אוֹפִיר, וְזָהָב מוֹפָז, וְזָהָב
שְׁחוּט, וְזָהָב סָגוּר, וְזָהָב פְּרוּסִים. זָהָב
וְזָהָב טוֹב – דְּכַתְּיִב: “וְזָהָב הָאֲרָץ
הַהוּא טוֹב,” זָהָב אוֹפִיר – דְּאָתְּנִי
מֵאוֹפִיר, זָהָב מוֹפָז –

The mishna states: **On every other day, it was of greenish gold but on this day it was of a red gold.^N 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 glistening gold (1 Kings 10:18), and *shahut* gold (1 Kings 10:17), and closed gold (1 Kings 10:21), and *parvayim* gold (II 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. Glistening [*mufaz*] gold is so named**

NOTES

But on this day it was soft and thin – וְהַיּוֹם רַךְ: Since 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 arm of the High Priest could assist him – וְרָעוּ שֶׁל בַּהֲן: The handle extended to his underarm. He could therefore support it with his hands and the full length of his arm (*Me’iri*).

Ring [*niashtik*] – מִיֵּאֲשֵׁתִיק: There are many suggested interpretations for this. Rashi and several *geonim* explain that there were two rings on it that clattered together when moved. The *Me’iri* suggests that the *niashtik* was a base upon which

the coal pan was placed. Others suggest that the *niashtik* was a type of sheath that was placed over the coal pan’s handle. Because the coals sat on the coal pan for a time, the handle naturally became very hot and the sheath protected the priest’s hand (*Tosafot; Tosafot Yeshanim*). Some *geonim* explain that the sheath covered the entire coal pan to prevent the coals from becoming extinguished.

Red gold – זָהָב אָדוּם: Some suggest the red gold was used because it was the most esteemed of the various types of gold, which is why it appears last in Rav Hisda’s list (*Me’iri*). Others write that red gold was used because it was reminiscent of the sprinkling of the bull’s blood (*Gevurat Ari*; see *Siah Yitzhak*).

Perek IV
Daf 45 Amud a

NOTES

Resembles the luster of pearls [*paz*] – שְׁדוּמָה לְפָז: 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, *mofaz* is an abbreviation of *zahav mi’ofaz*, meaning gold from a place called Ofaz.

BACKGROUND

Types of gold – מִיֵּי זָהָב: 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.

שְׁדוּמָה לְפָז, זָהָב שְׁחוּט – שְׁנִטוּה
כְּחוּט, זָהָב סָגוּר – בְּשַׁעָה שְׁנַפְתָּח
כָּל הַחֲנוּיִת נִסְגְּרוֹת, זָהָב פְּרוּסִים –
שְׁדוּמָה לְדָם הַפְּרִים.

because it resembles the luster of pearls [*paz*]^N in the way it glistens. *Shahut* gold is named as such because it is very malleable and is spun like thread [*shenitve kehut*]. *Shahut* is a contraction of the words *shenitve kehut*. Closed gold is so called because when a shop opens to sell it, all the other shops close, as no one is interested in purchasing any other type of gold. *Parvayim* gold is so called because its redness resembles the blood of bulls [*parim*].

רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: חֲמִשָּׁה הֵן, וְכָל חֵד וְחֵד
אֵית בֵּיה זָהָב וְזָהָב טוֹב. תַּנָּא נִמְי
הַכֵּי: בְּכָל יוֹם הָיָה זָהָבָה יְרוּקָה וְהַיּוֹם
אָדוּם, וְהֵינּוּ זָהָב פְּרוּסִים שְׁדוּמָה לְדָם
הַפְּרִים.

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 *parvayim* 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 *parvayim* gold which resembles the blood of bulls.^B

Ascending the ramp – עלִיהָ לַמִּזְבֵּחַ: Every day, the priests ascend the altar on its eastern side and descend on its western side. On Yom Kippur, they ascend and descend in the middle of the altar, out of respect for the eminence for the High Priest (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 2:5).

Sanctifying the hands and feet – קְדוּשַׁת יָדַי וְרַגְלַי: Every day, the High Priest sanctifies his hands and feet using the laver, in the same way the rest of the priests do. On Yom Kippur, due to his eminence, he sanctifies himself using a golden flask (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 2:5).

The arrangements on the altar – הַמְעֲרֹכֹת עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ: Every day, there were three arrangements of wood on the altar, but on Yom Kippur, there were four arrangements. This is in accordance with the ruling of Rabbi Yosei, as the *halakha* follows his opinion in disputes with his colleagues (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 2:5).

One for the upkeep of the fire – אַחַת שְׁלֵקִים הָאֵשׁ: There was a large arrangement on the altar on which the limbs and the fats were burned. A second arrangement supplied the coals for the incense, while a third arrangement served to maintain the fire of the main arrangement (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 2:4).

NOTES

The priests ascend in the middle of the ramp – עוֹלִין – בְּאֶמְצַע: 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; Me'iri*).

One for the upkeep [kiyyum] of the fire – אַחַת שְׁלֵקִים הָאֵשׁ: Some interpret the word *kiyyum* 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; *Me'iri*). Others interpret the word *kiyyum* 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; *Me'iri*).

”בְּכֹל יוֹם מִקְרִיב פָּרֶס שַׁחֲרִית וְכוּ בְּכֹל יוֹם הַיְתֵתָה דָּקָה וְהַיּוֹם דָּקָה מִן הַדָּקָה.” תַּנּוּ רַבֵּנּוּ: דָּקָה מִהַ תְּלַמּוּד לֹא מֵרָ? וְהֵלֵא כְּבֹר נְאֻמָּר: ”וְשַׁחֲקֵת מִמֶּנָּה הַדָּק!” אֵלֵא: לְהַבִּיא דָּקָה מִן הַדָּקָה.

§ The mishna states: **On every other day**, a priest sacrificed a *peras*, half of a *maneh*, of incense in the morning, and a *peras* 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 by 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.**

”בְּכֹל יוֹם בְּהַנִּים עוֹלִין בְּמִזְרְחוֹ שֶׁל כְּבֹשׁ.” דְּאָמַר מַר: כָּל פְּיּוֹת שְׂאֵתָה פּוֹנֶה לֹא יְהוּ אֶלֵא דֶרֶךְ יְמִין לַמִּזְרָח.

§ 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.^h

”וְהַיּוֹם (עוֹלִין) בְּאֶמְצַע (וְיִרְדּוּן) בְּאֶמְצַע.” מֵאֵי טַעְמָא – מִשּׁוּם כְּבוֹדוֹ דְּכֹהֵן גְּדוֹל.

§ The mishna continues: **But on this day** the priests ascend in the middle of the rampⁿ and descend in the middle. **What is the reason? Due to the eminence of the High Priest** he should not walk on the side but in the middle.

”בְּכֹל יוֹם בְּהֵן [גְּדוֹל] מִקְדָּשׁ יְדֵיו וְרַגְלָיו מִן הַכֵּיזָר” וְכוּ. מֵאֵי טַעְמָא – מִשּׁוּם כְּבוֹדוֹ שֶׁל בְּהֵן גְּדוֹל.

§ We learned in the mishna that **every other day the High Priest sanctifies his hands and his feet from the laver** like the other priests, and on this day he sanctifies them from the golden flask. **What is the reason? Due to the eminence of the High Priest.**^h

”בְּכֹל יוֹם הָיוּ שֵׁם אַרְבַּע מְעֲרֹכֹת.” תַּנּוּ רַבֵּנּוּ: בְּכֹל יוֹם הָיוּ שְׁתַּיִם מְעֲרֹכֹת וְהַיּוֹם שְׁלֹשׁ. אַחַת מְעֲרֹכָה גְּדוֹלָה, וְאַחַת מְעֲרֹכָה שְׁנִיָּה שֶׁל קְטוֹרֶת, וְאַחַת שְׁמוֹסִיפִין בּוֹ בַּיּוֹם. דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

§ 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 Tosefta: 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.

רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: בְּכֹל יוֹם שְׁלֹשׁ וְהַיּוֹם אַרְבַּע; אַחַת שֶׁל מְעֲרֹכָה גְּדוֹלָה, וְאַחַת מְעֲרֹכָה שְׁנִיָּה שֶׁל קְטוֹרֶת, וְאַחַת שֶׁל קִיּוּם הָאֵשׁ, וְאַחַת שְׁמוֹסִיפִין בּוֹ בַּיּוֹם.

Rabbi Yosei says: **On every other day** there were three arrangements, **but on this day there were four:**^h **One**, the large arrangement; **and one**, the second arrangement for the incense; **and one**, for the upkeep of the fire,^{nh} 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.

רַבִּי מֵאִיר (מֵאִיר) אוֹמֵר: בְּכֹל יוֹם אַרְבַּע וְהַיּוֹם חֲמִשׁ: אַחַת שֶׁל מְעֲרֹכָה גְּדוֹלָה, וְאַחַת שֶׁל מְעֲרֹכָה שְׁנִיָּה שֶׁל קְטוֹרֶת, וְאַחַת שֶׁל קִיּוּם הָאֵשׁ, וְאַחַת לְאִיבָרִים וּפְדָרִים שֶׁלֹּא נִתְעַבְּלוּ מִבְּעָרֵב, וְאַחַת שְׁמוֹסִיפִין בּוֹ בַּיּוֹם.

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.

דְּכוּלֵי עֲלָמָא מִיהַת תְּרַמֵּי אֵית לְהוּ, מְנַלְן? אָמַר קְרָא: ”הִיא הָעוֹלָה עַל מוֹקְדָה עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ כָּל הַלַּיְלָה” – וְזוֹ מְעֲרֹכָה גְּדוֹלָה, ”וְאֵשׁ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תּוֹקֵד בּוֹ” – וְזוֹ מְעֲרֹכָה שְׁנִיָּה שֶׁל קְטוֹרֶת. וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי, קִיּוּם הָאֵשׁ מִנָּא לִיהָ? נִפְקָא לִיהָ מִ”וְהָאֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תּוֹקֵד בּוֹ”.

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 Yosei 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 6:5), which mentions fire for the third time.

Thin wood chips – הַצֵּתת אֱלִיתָא: The flame for keeping up the fire of the large arrangement is not lit below but upon the top of the altar itself (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 2:9).

NOTES

That a non-priest could approach the altar – שָׂרָר קָרֵב: The Torah states: “But they must not draw near to the sacred utensils, nor to the altar, that they not die, neither they, nor you” (Numbers 18:3). This applies even to the Levites who serve in the Temple. Since a non-priest is prohibited to approach the altar, any service that is performed on the altar is necessarily executed by priests.

Do not expound the word and – וְאִיזְוֵי לָא דְרָשִׁי: The word “and,” indicated by the single-letter prefix *vav*, usually functions as a conjunction. However, sometimes it has no obvious purpose. Furthermore, even when it does serve as a conjunction of two clauses, since in many cases the Torah presents a similar construction without the use of the *vav*, whenever it is used it can be deemed to be superfluous. Therefore the Sages often expound a *vav* to include additional *halakhot* that are not mentioned explicitly in the verse.

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? הֲהוּא לְהַצֵּתת אֱלִיתָא הוּא דְאֵתָא. דְּתַנְיָא, הִיָּה רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: מִנִּין לְהַצֵּתת אֱלִיתָא שְׁלֵא תְהֵא אֱלֵא בְּרֵאשׁוּ שְׁלֵ מִזְבֵּחַ – תְּלָמוּד לֹמַר: “וְהָאֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תִּקְדָּה בּוֹ”. אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי: מִנִּין שְׁעוֹשֶׂה מַעֲרָכָה לְקִיּוּם הָאֵשׁ – תְּלָמוּד לֹמַר: “וְהָאֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תִּקְדָּה בּוֹ”.

וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי, הַצֵּתת אֱלִיתָא מִנָּא לִיָּה? נִפְקָא לִיָּה מִהֵיכָא דְנִפְקָא לִיָּה לְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן. דְּתַנְיָא: “וְנִתְּנוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן אֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ” – לִיָּמַד עַל הַצֵּתת אֱלִיתָא שְׁלֵא תְהֵא אֱלֵא בְּכַהֵן כְּשׁוֹר, וּבְכָלִי שְׂרָת, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, אָמַר לֹ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: וְכִי תַעֲלֶה עַל דְּעִתְךָ שָׂרָר קָרֵב לְגַבִּי מִזְבֵּחַ? אֱלֵא: לִיָּמַד עַל הַצֵּתת אֱלִיתָא שְׁלֵא תְהֵא אֱלֵא בְּרֵאשׁוּ שְׁלֵ מִזְבֵּחַ.

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה – אִי מִהֵתֵם הוּא אֲמִינָא: קָאִי אֲאָרְעָא וְעֵבִיד בְּמַפְוּחָא, קָא מְשַׁמְעֵ לִן.

וְרַבִּי מֵאִיר, אִיבָרִים וּפְדָרִים שְׁלֵא נִתְעַבְלוּ מִבְּעָרֵב מִנָּא לִיָּה? נִפְקָא לִיָּה מִזִּיאֵשׁ – וְרַבִּנּוּ, וְאִיזְוֵי לָא דְרָשִׁי.

וְרַבִּנּוּ, אִיבָרִים וּפְדָרִים שְׁלֵא נִתְעַבְלוּ מִבְּעָרֵב מֵאִי עֵבִיד לְהוּ? מִהֵדֵר לְהוּ לְמַעֲרָכָה גְדוּלָה. דְּתַנְיָא: מִנִּין לְאִיבָרִים וּפְדָרִים שְׁלֵא נִתְעַבְלוּ מִבְּעָרֵב

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,¹¹ 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), which indicates that the fire that is brought there has to be lit on the altar itself. Rabbi Yosei said: From where is it 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 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 teaches about the kindling of the wood chips that it may be done only by a fit priest and one who is robed in the priestly vestments of service; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Shimon said to him: There is no need for a verse to teach that a priest must kindle the chips, for could it enter your mind that a non-priest could approach the altar?¹² Rather, this verse teaches about the kindling of the wood chips, that they may be lit only at the top of the altar.

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.”¹³

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,

Perek IV
Daf 45 Amud b

שְׁפוּדָרִין עַל גְּבִי מִזְבֵּחַ, וְאִם אֵין מְחִזְקִין – שְׁפוּדָרִין עַל הַכֶּבֶשׂ אוֹ עַל גְּבִי סוּבֵב עַד שְׁעוֹשֶׂה מַעֲרָכָה גְדוּלָה וְסוּדָרִין, תְּלָמוּד לֹמַר: “אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל הָאֵשׁ אֶת הָעוֹלָה עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ”.

that they are arranged upon the altar, and if the space on the altar cannot hold them, that they are arranged upon the ramp or upon the ledge that protrudes from the altar, until the large arrangement is made the following day and then they are arranged upon it? The verse states: “That which the fire will consume of the burnt-offering, on the altar” (Leviticus 6:3). This is taken to mean that those items that the fire already consumed are once again placed upon the altar.

ורבי מאיר: עיבולי עולה – אתה מחזיר, ואי אתה מחזיר עיבולי קטורת. דתני רבי חנניא בר מניומי בדבי רבי אליעזר בן יעקב: “אשר תאכל האש את העולה על המזבח” – עיבולי עולה אתה מחזיר ואי אתה מחזיר עיבולי קטורת.

דכולי עלמא מיהת מוספין בו ביום אית להו, מנא להו? נפקא להו מ”והאש”, ואפילו למאן דלא דריש “וא” – “וא” ה”א” דריש.

“אש תמיד” למאי אתא? מבעי ליה לכדתניא: “אש תמיד תוקד על המזבח לא תכבה” לימד על מערכה שניה של קטורת שלא תהא אלא על המזבח החיצון.

אש מחתה ומנורה מניין? ודין הוא: נאמרה אש בקטורת, ונאמרה אש במחטה ומנורה, מה להלן על מזבח החיצון – אף כאן על המזבח החיצון.

או כלך לדרך זו: נאמרה אש בקטורת, ונאמרה אש במחטה ומנורה, מה להלן בקטורת לו – אף מחטה ומנורה בקטורת לו.

תלמוד לומר: “אש תמיד תוקד על המזבח לא תכבה” – אש תמיד שאמרה לך לא תהא אלא בראשו של מזבח החיצון.

למדנו אש למנורה, אש למחטה מניין? ודין הוא: נאמרה אש במחטה ונאמרה אש במנורה, מה להלן על גבי מזבח החיצון – אף כאן על מזבח החיצון.

או כלך לדרך זו: נאמרה אש בקטורת ונאמרה אש במחטה, מה להלן בקטורת לו – אף כאן בקטורת לו.

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 Ḥananyā bar Mīnyomi 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 6:3). 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.^h

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.”ⁿ

The Gemara notes that there is an additional mention of the altar fire, which has not yet been explained: The phrase “a perpetual fire” (Leviticus 6:6), for what *halakha* does it come to teach? It is required for the *halakha* that was taught in the following *baraita*: The verse states: “A perpetual fire shall be kept burningⁿ on the altar, it shall not go out” (Leviticus 6:6). This teaches about the second arrangement of wood to produce coals for the incense, that it is set up only on the outer altar.

From where is it derived that coals of fire that are taken with a coal pan^N for the incense on Yom Kippur and for the fire for lighting the candelabrum^h must also be from the outer altar? It is a logical derivation. “Fire” is statedⁿ with regard to the daily incense offering, and “fire” is stated with regard to the incense coal pan and the candelabrum. Just as there, in the case of the daily incense offering, the fire is taken from upon the outer altar, so too here, in the case of the incense coal pan and the candelabrum, the fire should be taken from upon the outer altar.^h

If the matter is derived through reasoning, it is also possible to posit an alternative argument: Or, alternatively, one could go this way. “Fire” is stated with regard to the daily incense offering, and “fire” is stated with regard to the incense coal pan and the candelabrum. Just as there, in the case of the daily incense offering, the fire is taken from a place near to it, i.e., the outer altar, so too, in the case of the incense coal pan and the candelabrum, the fire should be taken from a place near to it, i.e., the inner altar.

Since there are two equally logical derivations, a verse is required to teach the *halakha*. The verse states: “A perpetual fire shall be kept burning on the altar, it shall not go out” (Leviticus 6:6). The “perpetual fire” that I told you, i.e., the fire of the candelabrum, about which the Torah states “a lamp to burn continually” (Exodus 27:20), should be lit only from a fire that is upon the top of the outer altar.

We have therefore learned the source for the fire for the candelabrum. From where do we derive the same *halakha* for the fire for the incense coal pan on Yom Kippur? It is a logical derivation. “Fire” is stated with regard to the incense coal pan on Yom Kippur, and “fire” is stated with regard to the candelabrum. Just as there, in the case of the candelabrum, the fire is taken from upon the outer altar, so too, here, in the case of the incense coal pan, the fire should be taken from upon the outer altar.

If the matter is derived through reasoning, it is also possible to posit an alternative argument: Or, alternatively, one could go this way: “Fire” is stated with regard to the daily incense offering, and “fire” is stated with regard to the incense coal pan on Yom Kippur. Just as there, in the case of the daily incense offering, the fire is taken from a place near to it, i.e., the outer altar, so too, here, in the case of fire for the incense coal pan, the fire should be taken from a place near to it, i.e., the inner altar.

Incense that fell off the altar – שְׁפָקָה: Incense that falls off the altar is not returned to it, even whole pieces that were not burned (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 3:2).

Fire for lighting the candelabrum – אש מנורה: The Rambam rules that if the westernmost lamp of the candelabrum goes out, it is relit only from the fire of the outer altar. The other lamps, however, are lit from each other. The Ra’avad challenges and rejects this approach. He claims that there is no distinction between the westernmost lamp and the other lamps and that 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 Temidin UMusafin* 3:13, and in the comments of *Kesef Mishne* and *Lehem Mishne*).

An arrangement for the incense – מערכה שניה: 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 Temidin UMusafin* 2:4).

NOTES

Expound the phrase “and the” – דריש: The combination of the letters *vav* and *heh* cannot be explained as merely a conjunction without further significance. The *vav* must therefore teach that something additional should be expounded.

A perpetual fire shall be kept burning – אש תמיד: 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 6:5), and this is indeed how the *Sifrei* derives the *halakha* (*Givat Shaul*).

From where is derived fire with the coal pan – מניין: 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 (*Tosefot HaRosh*).

Fire is stated – נאמרה אש: The Gemara derivation that the fire used both for the coal pan for 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 16:12), 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.

NOTES

Only partially before the Lord – שִׁמְקָצְתוּ לִפְנֵי ה' – According to the present text of the Gemara, the reference is to the position of the altar vis-à-vis the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies. According to other versions of the text, the reference is not to the location but to the purpose: 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).

תלמוד לומר: 'ולקח מלא המזבח גחלי אש מעל המזבח מלפני ה'.' איזהו מזבח שמקצתו לפני ה' ואין כולו לפני ה' – הוי אומר זה מזבח החיצון.

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 the Lord" suggests it is not entirely before the Lord. **Which altar is only partially before the Lord,ⁿ 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.

ואיצטרויך למיכתב "מעל המזבח" ואיצטרויך למיכתב "מלפני ה'"; דאי כתב רחמנא "מעל המזבח" – הוה אמינא: מאי מזבח – מזבח פנימי, כתב רחמנא "מלפני ה'" – ואי כתב רחמנא "מלפני ה'" – הוה אמינא: דוקא מלפני ה'.

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;

Perek IV
Daf 46 Amud a

NOTES

Even on Shabbat – ואפילו בשבת: 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 (*Eshkol HaKofer*).

אבל מהאי גיסא ומהאי גיסא אימא לא – צריכא.

but from this side or from that side of the altar, both of which are not directly in front of the Sanctuary's entrance, I would say that no, the fire may not be taken from there. Therefore, it is necessary to write both terms in order to teach this *halakha*.

אמר רבי אלעזר משום בר קפרא, אומר היה רבי מאיר: איברי עולה שנתותרו – עושה להן מערכה בפני עצמה וסודרן ואפילו בשבת.

Rabbi Elazar said in the name of bar Kappara: Rabbi Meir would say: With regard to limbs of a burnt-offering that remained on the altar from the previous night and which were not fully consumed, one should make a separate arrangement of wood for them and arrange them upon it to be burned. And this is done even on Shabbat.ⁿ

מאי קא משמע לן? תנינא: בכל יום היו שם ארבע מערכות! אמר רבי אבין: לא נצרכה אלא לפסולין.

What is bar Kappara teaching us when he informs us that Rabbi Meir requires a separate arrangement to be made? Surely, we already learned this in the mishna that cites Rabbi Meir as saying: **On every other day, there were four arrangements of wood there, upon the altar.** The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Avin said:** Bar Kappara's teaching is needed only in order to teach the requirement to set up a fourth arrangement, even though it is only for limbs of disqualified offerings. As certain disqualifications apply only *ab initio*, if the offering is nevertheless brought upon the altar it should not then be removed. Bar Kappara teaches that Rabbi Meir's ruling applies in the event that limbs of such an offering were not fully consumed.

ודוקא שמשלה בהן האור, אבל לא משלה בהן האור – לא.

The Gemara qualifies this: **But this applies specifically when the fire has already taken hold of them and they have begun to burn. But if the fire has not yet taken hold of them, no, a separate arrangement is not made in order to burn them.**

איכא דאמרי: אחד פשוטין ואחד פסולין, אי משלה בהן האור – אין, ואי לא – לא.

There are those who say a different version of this qualification: **Both with regard to the limbs of valid offerings and of disqualified offerings, if the fire has already taken hold of them and they have begun to burn, yes, a separate arrangement is made to burn them, but if the fire did not take hold of them, no, a separate arrangement is not made in order to burn them.**

"ואפילו בשבת." תנינא: והיום חמש!

Bar Kappara concluded: **And this is done even on Shabbat.** But surely, we already learned this in the mishna that cites Rabbi Meir as saying: **But on this day, on Yom Kippur, there are five.** This means that the arrangement for burning any remaining limbs is made also on Yom Kippur, despite the fact that all the Shabbat prohibitions apply.