



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The master had stated: I know (of the prohibition regarding the occupation of the Sanctuary) only for the time of (the burning of) the incense.

The *Gemora* asks: How is this implied (in the verse)?

Rava, and also Rabbi Yitzchak bar Avdimi, and likewise Rabbi Elozar said: It is written: *And he shall provide atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the nation of Israel.* What atonement is there which obtains equally for himself, his household, his brethren, the *Kohanim*, and the whole nation of Israel? It is the burning of the incense.

The *Gemora* asks: But does the incense provide atonement?

The *Gemora* answers: Yes, for Rabbi Chananya cited a *braisa*: We learn that the incense provides atonement, for it is written: *And he placed the incense and provided atonement for the people.* And the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael taught: For what does incense atone? It atones for *lashon hara*; let that which is performed in private come and atone for a sin committed in secret.

We have learned elsewhere in a *Mishna*: People must separate from the place between the Antechamber

and the Altar at the time of the burning of the incense.

Rabbi Elozar said: This was taught only during the time of the burning of the incense in the Sanctuary, but during the time the incense was being burned in the Holy of Holies, people were required to separate from the Sanctuary, but not from the place between the Antechamber and the Altar.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah, or as some say, the question was asked without a name: Rabbi Yosi says: Just as they separate from the place between the Antechamber and Altar during the (burning of) the incense, so do they separate at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the anointed Kohen’s bull, and of the bull offered up because of a communal error, and of the he-goats (offered up) because of idolatry. What stringency is there, then, between the Sanctuary and the space between the Antechamber and the Altar? There is none except that from the Sanctuary they must separate both during the time of the burning of the incense, and outside of the time of the burning of the incense (but rather during the time that the blood service is being performed), but from the space between the Antechamber and the Altar, people must separate only in the time of the incense.



At any rate (the *Gemora* infers from the *braisa*), at the time of the burning of the incense, they do separate (from the space between the Antechamber and the Altar). Would you not say that it means during the time of the burning (of the incense) in the Holy of Holies?

The *Gemora* answers: No; the reference is to the time of burning in the Sanctuary.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, how do we explain the text, 'what then is the stringency between the two places'? Is the above the only difference in stringency? Is there not also the following difference: from the Sanctuary they separate during the time both of the burning of the incense in the Sanctuary itself, and of the burning of the incense in the Holy of Holies, whereas from the place between the Antechamber and the Altar they separate only during the time of the burning of the incense in the Sanctuary itself?

The *Gemora*, therefore, explains the *braisa* as follows: Except that from the Sanctuary they are required to separate both during the time of the burning of incense (in the Sanctuary) and outside of the time of the burning of the incense (in the Sanctuary), but from the place between the Antechamber and the Altar, they separate only in the time of the burning of the incense (in the Sanctuary).

The *Gemora* asks: But is there not also this stringency that they separate from the Sanctuary both during its own sanctification (when the blood service is being performed there) and that of the Holy of Holies, whereas from the space between the Antechamber

and the Altar, they do not separate except when the Sanctuary is being sanctified?

Rava said: The term 'separate' includes it all in one. [Once the stringency is taught regarding the incense, there is no need to repeat it regarding the blood service; the same logic applies by both of them.]

The master had stated: So do they separate at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the anointed Kohen's bull, and of the bull offered up because of an error of the nation, and of the he-goats offered up because of idolatry.

Rabbi Pedas explained where we know this from: We infer that through a *gezeirah shavah* using the word 'atonement,' 'atonement' from Yom Kippur.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah said: Conclude from this that the stringencies of sanctity are Biblical, and indeed they have been taught to us by tradition (*halachah l'Moshe mi'Sinai*), for if it should enter your mind that they are only a Rabbinical enactment, then what (in law) would be the difference in the space between the Antechamber and the Altar (from which they must separate), for fear that they might enter (the Sanctuary) by accident; they should really separate from the entire Courtyard, out of fear that they might accidentally enter?

The *Gemora* disagrees: The space between the Antechamber and the Altar, since it is not marked off in any fashion, is not recognizable sufficiently, whereas the Courtyard, since there is the outer Altar to mark it off, is sufficiently recognizable.

Rava said: Conclude from this that the sanctity of the Antechamber and the Sanctuary is the same, for if it should enter your mind that they are of two different degrees of sanctity, then the sanctity of the Antechamber itself is due only to Rabbinic enactment; shall we then enact a preventive measure to prevent the violation of another preventive measure?

The *Gemora* disagrees: No, the Antechamber and the space between the Antechamber and the Altar are of one degree of sanctity; the Sanctuary and the Antechamber, however, are of two degrees of sanctity.

The *Mishna* had stated: On other days, he would take them out with a silver shovel.

The *Gemora* explains the reason for this: The Torah has consideration for the money of Israel.

The *Mishna* had stated: Today (on Yom Kippur), he took them out with a golden shovel, in which he was to bring them in:

The *Gemora* explains the reason for this (that it wasn't poured from one shovel to another): It was because of the weakness of the Kohen Gadol.

The *Mishna* had stated: On other days, he would scoop them up with a shovel containing four kavin.

A Tanna taught: One kav of the coals became scattered (during his pouring), and he swept it into the canal.

The *Gemora* asks: There is one *braisa* that teaches that it was one kav, and another that it was two kavin. Now, it is quite right according to the one which teaches 'one kav,' for it is in accordance with that which the Rabbis said, but the one that taught 'two kavin,' is not in accordance with the Rabbis or with Rabbi Yosi!?

Rav Chisda said: It is Rabbi Yishmael, the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah, for it was taught: Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: He brought the coals in a shovel containing two kavin.

Rav Ashi said: You can also say that it is in accordance with Rabbi Yosi, and he said it as follows: On other days he would take them up with a shovel containing a se'ah of the Wilderness (which was equal to five Jerusalem kavin) and pour it into one containing three Jerusalem kavin (which meant that two kavin remained).

The *Mishna* had stated: On other days, the shovel was heavy, but this day, it was light:

A Tanna taught: On other days it (its sides) was of thick metal, but this day, it was thin.

The *Mishna* had stated: On other days, its handle was short, but this day, it was long:

The *Gemora* explains the reason for this: It was that the arm of the Kohen Gadol may support it.

A Tanna taught: On other days, it had no ring (attached to the handle), today it had one; these are the words of the son of the Segan.



The *Mishna* had stated: On other days, its gold was yellowish.

Rav Chisda said: There are seven kinds of gold: gold; good gold; gold of Ophir; fine gold; spun gold; closed gold; parvayim gold.

Rav Ashi said: There are but five varieties of gold, each having gold and good gold.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: On other days the gold (of the shovel) was yellowish, but this day it was red, and that was the parvayim gold, which looks like the blood of a bull.

DAILY MASHAL

No Man shall....

From the *Gemora* it is evident that there is a prohibition from the torah not to be in the Heichal (Ohel Moed) at the time when the kohen gadol is performing the avodas haketores. This is learned from a verse. It is asked by the Acharonim as to why the Rishonim who list all the mitzvos in the Torah omit this particular one? Why is it not counted as its own commandment?

Rav Yeruchem Fishel Perlow in his explanation to the Resag (183) answers with an innovative approach to the issur. He explains that the issur is not on the individual (*gavra*) to make sure that he is not in that particular area of the Beis Hamikdosh during the avodas haketores. The mitzva is that the ketores should be done in the correct method. One of the

dinim of the ketores is that there should not be anybody there throughout the avodas haketores. If someone was there, that renders the ketores invalid. Accordingly, this is why it is not regarded as its own mitzva. It is not an independent mitzva, rather it is a component in the mitzva of ketores.

One of the proofs that he brings is from our *Gemora* which states the reason for this prohibition. The ketores which is brought in a secret place, atones for the sin which one tends to perform in private, namely *loshon hora*. Analyzing the comparison, the sinner in private is compared to the kohen doing the ketores secretly and that is where the issur is - the performing of the ketores incorrectly, not in the person who entered during the avodah.

Another proof is from a *Yerushalmi* that relates the story with Shimon Hatzadik on Yom Kippur. The *Yerushalmi* asks (quoted by the Rishonim on daf 39), how could someone be in the Ohel Moed at that time and even the heavenly angels whose faces are like a person are included in the passuk of *v'chol adam*? The *Yerushalmi* answers that it was the shechina and not a malach or a person. The question on this is obvious. The Torah is not given to malachim, why is it necessary to expound from the passuk that malachim cannot be in the heichal during this time? Once again, it is evident that the issur is not on the person or malach entering, rather on the kohen, there is an obligation to perform the ketores correctly and that is only if there is nobody else around, including malachim.