



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

**According to Rabbi Meir, a separate fire was made on the Altar to burn the limbs of even the *passul* (disqualified) sacrifices.**

Bar Kappara teaches us that Rabbi Meir holds that a separate fire must be kindled in order to burn the sacrifices which were left over from the night before.

The *Gemora* asks: Aren't we told the same thing explicitly in the Mishnah?

The *Gemora* answers that Bar Kappara comes to teach us that we make a separate fire even for disqualified sacrifices. Certain sacrifices - even though they are disqualified, when accidentally put on the *mizbeyach* (Altar), are not taken off. Even for such sacrifices, we must make a separate fire.

The *Gemora* gives two different versions for this halachah. In the first version, in order to warrant a separate fire, these *pasul* sacrifices must have been partially burnt during the night. A separate fire for valid sacrifices, however, can be made even if the limbs were not burnt at all during the night. In a second version, even valid sacrifices warrant their own fire, but only if part of it was burnt during the night.

**Bar Kappara teaches us that one can even kindle this extra fire and burn these unconsumed limbs on Shabbos.**

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not known as well from the Mishnah. The Mishnah states that according to Rabbi Meir, there were five fires lit on Yom Kippur. Since Yom Kippur has the same prohibition regarding fire as Shabbos, we can assume that this extra fire was kindled on Shabbos as well!?

The *Gemora* answers that it could be that the Mishnah was speaking of Yom Kippur that followed Shabbos. The rule is that since the Shabbos sacrifices could be burned on Shabbos, they could also be burnt on Yom Kippur. There is no indication, however, that one can kindle a new fire to burn weekday sacrifices that weren't consumed during its proper day on Shabbos. Therefore, it was necessary for Bar Kappara to teach this *halachah*.

Rav Huna teaches, "The beginning supersedes and the end does not supersede." There is a disagreement between Rav Chisda and Rabbah as to the meaning of this ruling.

This cryptic statement has something to do with the daily sacrifice. Rav Chisda understood that it is referring to the laws of *tumah* (impurity). The rule is

that if the entire community is *tamei*, the daily sacrifice can be offered anyway, and the laws of *tumah* are superseded. Rav Chisda understood this to be true only for the slaughtering and the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice. This is referred to as “the beginning.” It is prohibited, however, to burn the limbs of a *tamei* sacrifice. This is referred to as “the end,” because it is the end of the sacrificial process. Hence this is the meaning of, “It supersedes the beginning, but not the end.” With regards to Shabbos, Rav Chisda holds that both the beginning and the end are superseded. This means that just as the sacrifice for Shabbos (this is called the beginning because it’s the beginning of a new sacrificial process) supersedes Shabbos, so too, the left over limbs from the day before, supersedes Shabbos. (This is called the end because it is the end of yesterday’s sacrificial process). Rabbah holds vice versa: Rav Huna’s statement was said in regard to Shabbos, and not *tumah*.

**An explanation of Rabbah’s reason, as to why the left over limbs does not supersede Shabbos.**

Rabbah explains his reasoning: Regarding *tumah* - the laws of *tumah* have already been superseded for this sacrifice. It, therefore, makes sense to allow the limbs to be burned as well. In regards to Shabbos, however, the laws of Shabbos have not been violated for the purposes of this sacrifice. It, therefore, would not be proper to violate Shabbos for the purpose of burning the left over limbs.

**An explanation of Rav Chisda’s reason, as to why burning limbs does not supersede *tumah*.**

Rav Chisda explains that the laws of Shabbos are considered non-existent (it is “hutrah” completely permitted) when there is an obligation to offer the daily sacrifice. Therefore, one may also burn the limbs even though this is not the essential part of the atonement. The laws of *tumah*, however, are considered merely “pushed off” (*dechuyah*) in regards to the daily sacrifice. They are still considered to exist. Consequently, the essential part of the atonement is allowed to be performed, but the burning of the limbs, which is not essential, is not.

**There is an argument as to whether fire taken from the Altar in order to light the Menorah or the incense is included in the prohibition of extinguishing the fire of the Altar.**

There is a prohibition to extinguish a fire on the Altar. The fire for the Menorah and the incense was taken from the Altar. Abaye holds that if one extinguishes the coal that was taken for that purpose, he is liable. Rava holds that he is not.

There are two versions to this argument. In the first version, if the coal is still on the top of the Altar, everyone agrees that he is liable. The disagreement is in the situation where the coal was brought to the floor of the Temple Courtyard. In the other version, everyone agrees that if the coal is brought to the floor, he is not liable. The disagreement is in the situation where the coal is still on the top of the Altar. The *Gemora* concludes that everyone can agree that when a coal is merely taken from the Altar with no ulterior purpose and it is extinguished, one is considered liable. The reason for this distinction is as follows: In the case when the coal was taken without



any ulterior purpose, it is considered still part of the Altar, while if the coal taken for another mitzvah, it is no longer considered part of the Altar.

**WE WILL RETURN TO YOU, TARAF BAKALPI**

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***Extinguishing the Fire of the Altar***

The *Gemora* says that if one takes coal from the Altar to the floor and then extinguishes it, he is liable for the prohibition of extinguishing the flame of the Altar.

The *Minchas Chinuch* points out that it appears that if one merely takes the coal off the Altar, he is not liable. The question is why not. The *Minchas Chinuch* brings a *Gemora* in *Beitzah*, which, according to many commentaries, rules that causing a fire to go out quicker is considered extinguishing. The *Gemora* says that if one takes oil from a fire on Shabbos, he is liable. In our case as well - merely taking the coal off the Altar, and causing it to go out quicker should render one liable. The *Minchas Chinuch* has no answer to this question.

The *Gemora* says that during the year the coal was poured from a large shovel to a smaller shovel. The coals that spilled to the floor were swept into a canal leading out of the Temple. This seems to be a problem of extinguishing the flame of the Altar. *Tosafos* answers that there is no problem since these coals are not suited to be placed back on the Altar. Since these coals will no longer be used for a mitzvah, extinguishing them is permissible.

### ***Initiating Bishul***

The *Chemdas Yisroel* brings a *Yerushalmi* that holds that the burning of the fats on the Altar would be considered "bishul" (cooking) regarding Shabbos. According to this, he asks the following question: Why is it permitted to burn the fats on the Altar in the beginning of Shabbos; it would be advantageous to wait until a few minutes prior to sunset, while they still would be fulfilling the mitzvah of *haktarah* (which must be done on Shabbos), they would not be required to transgress the *issur* of *bishul*?

He proves from this question that if one initiates the process of *bishul* on Shabbos, even though it does not cook until after Shabbos, he would still be violating the *issur* of *bishul*.

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Continuing the Mitzvah***

The *Mishna* had previously stated that every day they would bring a *p'ras* of *ketores* in the morning and afternoon. It would seem that this was done on Shabbos, as well.

*Gevuros Ari* asks that according to *Rashi* in *Zevachim* (109) who holds that a *kezayis* of *ketores* would be sufficient on a Biblical level, why is it permissible to burn the entire amount; the extra should be considered a burning for no purpose, and should not be allowed?

The *Acharonim* answer this question based on a *Netziv* who holds that once a person begins doing a mitzvah and in the process he does more than he is required of doing, all the extra is considered to be part of the mitzvah.