



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Tamid and Ketores

Morning and Afternoon

The *Mishna* discusses a case where they did not bring a *tamid* sacrifice or the *ketores* (incense) in the morning. Rabbi Shimon states: If they did not bring the *ketores* sacrifice in the morning, the entire *ketores* should be brought in the afternoon, as we only inaugurate the golden (i.e. inner) altar with *ketores* etc.

The *Gemora* asks: The *Mishna* never mentioned inauguration! [Why is Rabbi Shimon discussing inauguration?]

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* is as if it is missing words, and means as follows: If they did not bring the *tamid* sacrifice in the morning, they should not bring it in the afternoon. This is only if the altar had not yet been inaugurated. If it had been inaugurated, they should bring the *tamid* sacrifice in the afternoon. Rabbi Shimon stated: This is only if they did not bring the morning *tamid* because of forced circumstances or due to an accident. However, if they purposely did not bring it in the morning, they should not bring it in the afternoon. If they did not bring the *ketores* in the morning, they should still bring it in the afternoon.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this?

This is as the *braisa* states: *And the second lamb should be offered in the afternoon.* This teaches us that the second

lamb should be slaughtered in the afternoon, as opposed to the first lamb. This is only if the altar had not yet been inaugurated. However, if it had been inaugurated, even the first one can be brought in the afternoon. Rabbi Shimon states: When is this? It is only if they were victims of forced circumstances or it happened by accident. However, if they deliberately did not bring the morning *tamid*, they should not bring the one in the afternoon either. If they did not bring the *ketores* in the morning, they could still bring it in the afternoon.

The *Gemora* asks: Just because the *Kohanim* that morning were sinners, the altar should remain idle (and not have a sacrifice on it in the afternoon)?!

Rava explains: The *braisa* means that those same *Kohanim* (who deliberately sinned in the morning by not bringing the *tamid*) cannot offer the *tamid* in the afternoon, but others can.

The *Gemora* explains the last ruling of the *braisa*: If they did not bring the *ketores* in the morning, they should still bring it in the afternoon. The reason why the law by *ketores* is different is because it is uncommon that the *Kohanim* will act with negligence and not bring it; therefore, there was no necessity for a decree. The reason why they would always perform the *ketores* service is due to the fact that it brings wealth to the one who performs it, so it was dear to them.



The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon said that the entire *ketores* was brought in the afternoon, as the golden (i.e. inner) altar is only inaugurated with the *ketores* of the afternoon.

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the *braisa* state that it is only inaugurated with the *ketores* of the morning?

The *Gemora* answers: This is an argument among the *Tannaim*.

Abaye says: The opinion that the altar is inaugurated with the *ketores* of the afternoon is understandable. This is as the verse states: *Every morning when he (Aaron) cleans the lamps he shall burn it (the ketores)*. This indicates that if he did not light the *Menorah* the night before, how would he clean it the next morning? [*Rashi explains that being that the ketores is similar to the Menorah, it must also be that the ketores was brought in the afternoon before lighting the Menorah. This is indicated by the verse, And when Aharon raises the (flame of the) candles in the afternoon it (the ketores) should be burned.*]

The *Gemora* explains: It must be that the other opinion understands that we compare the inner altar to the outer altar. Just as the outer altar is inaugurated by the *tamid* of the morning, so too, the inner altar is inaugurated by the *ketores* of the morning. (50a)

Lechem Hapanim on Shabbos

The *Mishna* had stated: The *Shulchan* was only inaugurated with the *lechem hapanim* (showbreads) of *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* asks: This indicates that while the *Shulchan* would not be inaugurated during the week, the breads would still become sanctified if placed on the *Shulchan* during the week! [*This cannot be, as later (100a) it is*

clearly established that the breads only become holy on Shabbos!]

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* is teaching us that it will only become sanctified on *Shabbos* as well. This is similar to the end of the *Mishna* that states that the *Menorah* only becomes sanctified with its seven candles in the afternoon (*just as the Menorah is only lit in its time, which is the afternoon, so too everything pertaining to the breads is only on its time, which is Shabbos, including sanctifying them*). (50a)

Special Ketores

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: This was *ketores* that was offered by an individual on the outer altar, and it was a special ruling of the moment.

The *Gemora* asks: What is this referring to?

Rav Pappa says: This is referring to the *ketores* brought by the *Nesiim* (the leaders of each tribe) by the inauguration of the *Mishkan*.

The *Gemora* asks: The *braisa* indicates that an individual could not offer *ketores* on the outer altar, but he could offer *ketores* on the inner altar. It also indicates that an individual cannot offer *ketores* on the outer altar, but the public can. However, the *braisa* states: One might think that an individual can donate and offer *ketores* similar to the offering of the *Nesiim*, and we would say regarding this the verse: *what comes out of your lips (a pledge to bring a sacrifice) you should observe to do*. This is why the verse states: *You should not offer upon it alien incense*. One might think that an individual cannot donate such an offering, as there is no such obligatory offering (*and it is therefore deemed an alien incense*), but the public can decide to donate a public *ketores* offering, as there is an obligatory *ketores* from the public. This is why the verse

states: *You (plural) should not bring*. One might think that they cannot offer it on the inner altar but they can offer it on the outer altar. This is why the verse states: *The oil of anointing and the incense of the Sanctuary, like all I have commanded you they should do*. This indicates that these items can only be brought (or used) as explicitly instructed.

Rav Pappa answers: The (first) *braisa* is stating that it is not necessary to state that the public cannot offer *ketores* on the outer altar, as we have never found such a sacrifice permitted by the Torah; and it is not necessary to state that an individual cannot bring *ketores* on the inner altar, as we have never found such a sacrifice permitted by the Torah; but even an individual, who wishes to bring *ketores* on the outer altar, as we find by the *Nesiim*, he cannot do so, for that was a ruling of the moment. (50a – 50b)

Mishna

The *chavitin* (flour offering brought every day) of the *Kohen Gadol* would not be brought one half at a time. Rather, the entire *isaron* (a measure of flour) would be brought in the morning, and it would then be divided, with half of it brought in the morning and half in the afternoon. If the *Kohen Gadol* brought half of the *isaron* in the morning and then died, the newly appointed *Kohen Gadol* does not bring half of an *isaron* from his house, nor does he bring the half left by the first *Kohen Gadol*. Rather, he brings an entire *isaron* from his house and splits it, with half of it being offered and the other half is destroyed. The end result is that two halves are offered and two halves are destroyed. (50b)

Kohen Gadol's Chavitin

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If the verse would state *half of a minchah*, I would say that the *Kohen Gadol* could bring half of an *isaron* from his house in the morning and offer it, and he could later bring another half in the afternoon and offer it. This is why the verse states: *half of it in the*

morning and half of it in the afternoon, indicating that he offers half of an entire *isaron*. How is this done? It must be he brings an entire *isaron* in the morning and then splits it in half, offering half in the morning and half in the afternoon. If the half intended for the afternoon became impure or it was lost, one might think he should just bring another half *isaron* from his house and offer it in the afternoon. This is why the verse states: *half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening afternoon*, indicating that he offers half of an entire *isaron*. How is this done? It must be that he brings an entire *isaron*, divides it in half, and he then offers half and half is destroyed. The end result is that two halves are offered and two halves are destroyed.

If the *Kohen Gadol* brought half of the *isaron* in the morning and then died, one might think that the newly appointed *Kohen Gadol* should bring half of an *isaron* from his house or the half left by the first *Kohen Gadol*. This is why the verse states: *and half of it in the afternoon*. He brings a half from a whole. How is this done? He brings an entire *isaron* from his house and splits it, with half of it being offered and half is destroyed. The end result is that two halves are offered and two halves are destroyed.

The following *braisa* was taught before Rav Nachman by a teacher of *braisos*: The half left from the first *Kohen* and the second half left from present *Kohen* should be left until their appearance has changed (*overnight – thus invalidating them*) and then they should go to the place where invalidated offerings are burned.

Rav Nachman told him: It is understandable that the half from the first *Kohen Gadol* should be treated this way, as it was fit to be offered (*before he died*). However, why do we need to change the appearance of the leftover half of the present *Kohen* (*which is usually done when an offering is not definitely invalid*)? It was known beforehand that it



was going to be destroyed (*so let it be burned immediately without requiring it to remain overnight!*)?!

The *Gemora* answers: Who is the author of this teaching? It is the *Tanna* who taught teachings from the Academy of Rabbah bar Avuha, as he says that even *piggul* requires a change in appearance before being burned (*even though it is clearly invalid*).

Rav Ashi says: This could even be according to the Rabbis. Being that when the *isaron* was split, either half was eligible to be chosen as the half that was going to be brought by the second *Kohen*, they are both considered fit to be brought (*and therefore the leftover half must remain overnight before being burned*).

It was taught: How are the *chavitei Kohen Gadol* made? Rabbi Chiya bar Abba says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: They are baked and then fried. Rabbi Assi says in the name of Rabbi Chanina: They are fried and then baked.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba states: My opinion is more logical. The verse states, *tufinei* which indicates that it should be *tei'afenah na'eh* (*they should be baked while still "attractive"*). [*Rashi explains this means they should be light colored before baking, which would not be true if they were fried first as they would be at least partially blackened.*]

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba states: My opinion is more logical. The verse states, *tufinei* which indicates that it should be *tei'afenah na* (*they should be baked when they are partially cooked, indicating they had previously been fried somewhat before being baked*).

This argument is in fact an argument among the *Tannaim* in the following *braisa*: The verse states, *tufinei* which indicates that it should be *tei'afenah na*. Rebbe states: It

indicates that it should be *tei'afenah na'eh*. Rabbi Yosi (*some say Dosa*) states: *Tei'afenah rabbah* (*it should be baked, fried, and then baked again*), as he holds that both *na* and *na'eh* are implied.

The *Mishna* (96a) states: The *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol* are kneaded, shaped and baked inside the Courtyard, and their preparation overrides *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this?

Rav Huna says: The verse states, *tufinei* which which indicates that it should be *tei'afenah na'eh* (*they should be baked while still "attractive"*). If they are baked the day before, they will be puffy and stale (*not attractive*).

Rav Yosef asked: Perhaps it should be put into a pile of vegetables (*so that it should not be affected by the wind and become stale*)?

A *Tanna* in the Study Hall of Rabbi Yishmael taught: The source that it overrides *Shabbos* is the verse *it should be made*, indicating that this is made even on *Shabbos* and even if impure.

Abaye said that the source is from the following verse: fine flour as a *minchah* always; it is just as the *tamid* offerings (*which override Shabbos and tumah*). (50b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The position of Kohen Gadol

Our sugyos relate to the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, the *minchah* which he offered each day, half in the morning and half in the evening. It seems that it is relevant to clarify what a *Kohen Gadol* is and thereby understand the halachah to offer this *minchah*.

Could there be a *Kohen Gadol* without ordinary *Kohanim*? How would we react if there would be only one *Kohen* in the world and people would want to appoint him as the *Kohen Gadol*? At the root of this question stands the enquiry as to if the position of *Kohen Gadol* is a position of governance over the other *Kohanim* or a certain level of sanctity. If it is a position, just as there is no king without subjects, there is no *Kohen Gadol* without underling *Kohanim*. If it is a sanctity, his position does not depend on the presence of other *Kohanim*.

Two aspects of a *Kohen Gadol*: HaGaon Rav Efrayim Burdianski zt"l (Mishkenos Efrayim, 32) discusses the issue and proves that both aspects are correct. The *Kohen Gadol* is holy and rules over the other *Kohanim*. Therefore, there could be a situation where two *Kohanim* are holy with the sanctity of a *Kohen Gadol* whereas only one of them holds the position of *Kohen Gadol*.

Indeed, Talmudic sources (see Megillah 9b, Horayos 6a, and see Yoma 72b about a *Kohen* anointed for war) describe a situation where a few *Kohanim* gedolim exist at the same time. Rambam (in his commentary on the Mishnah, Horayos 6a) writes that the sanctity of the kehunah always lasts, even if the *Kohen Gadol* is removed from his post. The Gemara (Zevachim 101b, 120a) also expresses an opinion that Moshe and Aharon served as *Kohanim* gedolim together during the 40 years in the desert. However, as the **sanctity** of the kehunah gedolah could apply at the same time to a number of *Kohanim* but the position of *Kohen Gadol* belongs to only one *Kohen*, Toras Kohanim (*parshas Tzav, parshah 3*) explains, and thus rules Rambam (Hilchos Klei HaMikdash, 4:15), that two *Kohanim* gedolim are not appointed simultaneously.

Therefore, now that we realize that the position of *Kohen Gadol* contains two aspects, we can understand that some

of his mitzvos stem only from the position, such as the *minchas chavitin*. This mitzvah is not incumbent on a *Kohen Gadol* who is not appointed over the *Kohanim*, as the Yerushalmi (Yoma, Ch. 1, 4b) says, that a *Kohen* anointed for war does not bring a *minchas chavitin* as the Torah says "in his stead from his sons". In other words, only a *Kohen* whose position is passed on to his heirs is commanded to offer this minchah. A position is inherited but not sanctity and therefore only a *Kohen Gadol* appointed over the *Kohanim* must bring a *minchas chavitin*.

DAILY MASHAL

The Remo's Cheque

As stated in our sugya, the incense enriches the person who offers it. As a *sandak* is like someone who offers incense, the Remo wrote that the custom regarding a *sandak* is like that of the one who offers incense. Just as in the Temple we don't allow a *Kohen* to offer incense twice, we don't give a *sandak* two children, in order to give the segulah of riches to as many people as possible (Shulchan „Aruch, Y.D. 266:11).

The Vilna Gaon disagrees and writes "We never saw a *sandak* getting rich" (ibid, S.K. 46). People relate that Rabbi Eliezer Yehudah Finkel zt"l, the Rosh Yeshivah of Mir, asked HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Zeev of Brisk zt"l if he should neglect his learning to be a *sandak*. If he would become rich, he could support his yeshivah. But as the Vilna Gaon said that the task does not bring riches, perhaps he should not accept the honor. Rav Yitzchak Zeev replied that the Remo's cheque is also a good cheque... (Peninei HaGeriz).