

3 Sivan 5781
May 14, 2021



Yoma Daf 33

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

Abaye listed the order of the daily Altar service in the name of tradition and in accordance with Abba Shaul (who holds that the Menorah’s lamps were cleaned before the burning of the incense): The large pyre (on the Altar) comes before the second pyre for the incense; the second pyre for the incense comes before the arranging of the two logs of wood (which are placed on the large pyre); the arranging of the two logs of wood precedes the removing of the ashes from the inner Altar; the removing of the ashes from the inner Altar precedes the cleaning of the five lamps (of the Menorah); the cleaning of the five lamps precedes the (slaughtering and the throwing of the) blood of the Tamid offering; the blood of the Tamid offering precedes the cleaning of the two lamps; the cleaning of the two lamps precedes the (burning of the) incense (on the Inner Altar); the incense precedes the (burning of the) limbs (on the Outer Altar); the limbs come before the minchah (meal-offering); the minchah precedes the chavitin (minchah offering of the *Kohen Gadol*); the chavitin come before the (wine) libations; the libations precede the Mussaf offerings; the Mussaf offerings come before the spoons (of frankincense), and the spoons precede the Tamid afternoon-offering, as it is written: And he shall burn upon it the fat of the shelamim; i.e., upon “it” (the morning Tamid-offering), all the offerings are completed. (33a1)

The master had stated: The large pyre (on the Altar) comes before the second pyre for the incense.

The *Gemora* asks: From where is this derived?

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *This is the law of the olah offering; on the flame, on the Altar, all night.* This verse refers

to the large pyre. *And the fire of the Altar shall be aflame on it;* this refers to the second pyre for the incense.

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps I should reverse it?

The *Gemora* answers: It seems more logical that the large pyre should have preference because it brings more atonement (from all the offerings).

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary!? The second pyre is of greater value, for from it, the coals are taken into the Inner Sanctuary!?

The *Gemora* answers: Nevertheless, the one which causes more atonement is of greater value. And, if you like, say: If there would be no wood found for the second pyre, would one not bring it into the Sanctuary from the large pyre? (33a1 – 33a2)

It was stated: The second pyre for the incense comes before the arranging of the two logs of wood (which are placed on the large pyre).

The *Gemora* asks: From where do we know that? — Because it is written: And the *Kohen* shall kindle wood upon it every morning, i.e., ‘upon it’, but not upon the other pile, therefore, we can infer that the other pile is arranged already. But the word ‘upon it’ has its own text meaning? — ‘Upon it’ is written twice. (33a2)

The next step: The arranging of the two logs of wood precedes the removing of the ashes from the inner Altar.

The *Gemora* explains: Although regarding the one it is written: 'In the morning, in the morning' and regarding the other it is also written: 'In the morning, in the morning,' nevertheless that which is preparatory [to the incense burning] has preference. What would be preparatory? - The two logs of wood. - But surely you said that the two logs of wood belong to the large pyre!¹ — Rabbi Yirmiyah explains: Although these blocks of wood were used for the large pyre (which was not used for the incense), nevertheless, it is designated as 'wood,' and once he started with the large pyre, he concludes with the arranging of the logs.

Rav Ashi answers: If there would be no wood found for the second pyre, would one not bring it into the Sanctuary from the large pyre? (33a2 – 33a3)

The next step: The removing of the ashes from the inner Altar precedes the cleaning of the five lamps (of the Menorah).

What is the reason for this? Abaye said: This is a tradition with no logic. Rava said: This follows the dictum of Rish Lakish, for Rish Lakish said: One should not pass over mitzvos, and when the *Kohen* entered the Sanctuary, he reached the *mizbeyach* before he reached the menorah. [He, therefore, became obligated in that mitzvah first.] This is proven from a *Baraisa*: The Table was to the north two and one half amos away from the wall, the Menorah was to the south, two and one half amos away from the wall, and the Altar stood in the exact middle, extending somewhat outward.

The *Gemora* asks: But let the Altar stand between them?

The *Gemora* answers: Since it is written: And the Menorah opposite the Table, it is required that they see each other.

Rava said: From what Rish Lakish said, we infer that it is forbidden to bypass the arm in favor of the forehead (when it comes to putting on *tefillin*). How shall he do it? From the arm, he shall proceed to the forehead. (33a3 – 33b1)

The next step of the service: The cleaning of the five lamps precedes the (slaughtering and the throwing of the) blood of the Tamid offering.

What is the reason? Abaye said: [The phrases] 'In the morning, in the morning', [written] in connection with the two logs of wood, which are not necessary [there]: one applies to the cleaning of the five lamps which shall precede the blood of the tamid offering; the other applies to the blood of the tamid offering which is to come before the cleaning of the two lamps. 'One applies to the cleaning of the five lamps which should precede the blood of the tamid offering', for here are three [words], there only two. 'And the other applies to the blood of the tamid offering which should come before the cleaning of the two lamps', for, although in each case there are two, yet, that which obtains atonement has preference.

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: But say, perhaps, that one is to be applied to the separating of the ashes of the inner altar, which is to precede the blood of the tamid offering, for here are three words, there but two; and one applies to the blood of the tamid offering that should come before the cleaning of the five lamps, for, although in both cases there are but two, the one that obtains atonement is to have preference? — If so, what shall he interrupt it with? It would be reasonable according to Rish Lakish who said: The lamps were cleaned and [after interruption] cleaned again in order to arouse the whole Courtyard, but according to Rabbi Yochanan who interprets 'In the morning, in the morning', i.e., divide it into two mornings, what could be said? Said Ravina to Rav Ashi: Are the words 'In the morning, in the morning' in connection with the wood at all superfluous? Surely they are really necessary for their text meaning, the Merciful One saying that they should precede the second pile for the incense? He replied: Have we not explained: 'Upon it' but not upon the other pile, which indicated that the other must have been there already! (33b1 – 33b3)

¹ And are thus not preparatory to the incense.



The *Gemora* explains that the cleaning of the five lamps were done before the cleaning of the two lamps, for once he began cleaning them, he should clean the majority of them. – but then let him do six? - The verse says ‘lamps,’ and that connotes at least two. (33b3)

The next step in the daily service: The cleaning of the two lamps precedes the (burning of the) incense (on the Inner Altar).

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural source for this: It is because the Torah first writes, “when he cleans the lamps,” and then it writes, “he shall burn it.” (33b3)

The next step in the daily service: the incense precedes the (burning of the) limbs (on the Outer Altar).

The *Gemora* cites the source for this: It is because it has been taught in a *Baraisa*: Something (the incense) where the Torah writes, “in the morning, in the morning” should take precedence over something (the burning of the limbs) where the Torah writes, “in the morning” only one time. (33b3)

The next step in the daily service: the limbs come before the *minchah* (meal-offering).

The *Gemora* cites the source for this: It is because it has been taught in a *Baraisa*: From where do we know that no offering should be sacrificed prior to the *tamid* offering of the morning? It is because it is written: *And he shall arrange the olah upon the altar*, and Rava stated: “*The olah*” implies the first *olah* (of the day – the morning *tamid*; this teaches us that it is the first *korban* brought each day). (33b3 – 34a1)

INSIGHT TO THE DAF

Third Pyre

The *Gemora* states that there were two fires on the Altar every day - one called '*marachah gedolah*' which was used

for all the burnings of the meat (Rashi) and one for the ketores.

There actually was a third one as well, as stated on daf 45a according to Reb Yosi that was there to fulfill the requirement of the Torah to have fire on the Altar at all times.

Rashi (ibid) says that if there was not enough fire on the *marachah gedolah*, it would be replenished from this one. The Rambam does not mention this *halachah*.

The Chinuch (mitzva 132) states that this third fire is an integral part of the *mitzvah* and if the kohanim kindled the two first, but not this one, they would be negating the *mitzvah*.

The Meiri (here and on daf 45) comments similar to Rashi; however in Tamid 29a, he states that the third fire had no use whatsoever except to fulfill the requirement of having fire on the Altar.

I was wondering, do the Rambam and the Chinuch (and Meiri in Tamid) disagree with the *halachah* of Rashi, that if fire was needed for the *marachah gedolah*, it could not be taken from this fire? What would be done?

Touching the Tefillin

The *Gemora* cites Rish Lakish that one is not permitted to pass over a mitzvah and that is why the *Kohen* cleans the Altar before the preparation of the menorah for the Altar is closer to the entrance of the Heichal.

Rava (33b) states that we can learn from here regarding *tefillin* that the *shel yad* should be before the *shel rosh*. Rashi says that this is referring to the putting on of the *tefillin* for the arm comes before the head.

Rabbeinu Tam disagrees and says that it is referring to the removing and placing in the bag, that the *shel rosh* should be



placed first in order that the next day, one should come into contact with the *shel yad* first.

Rabeinu Eliyohu learns that it is referring to the touching of the *tefillin* during davening.

The Shemuas Chaim learns from here that it is not sufficient to touch the straps of the *shel rosh*, rather one is obligated to touch the *bayis* itself, for otherwise - one could touch the straps first and then touch the *shel yad*, for he is not passing over any *mitzvah*.

Is there an *inyon* perhaps to touch the *bayis* of the *shel yad* itself and not merely the sleeve which is covering the *shel yad*?

The placement of tefilin shel yad and tefilin shel rosh; the prohibition of passing over a mitzvah

Our *Gemora* teaches the prohibition of passing over a *mitzvah*. Therefore, the *Gemora* concludes, one should not pass over the *shel yad* for the *shel rosh*. Rashi understands this to mean that since one reaches his arm before reaching his head he has an obligation to put the *shel yad* on first in order to avoid a situation of passing over a *mitzvah*.

Tosafos disagrees with this explanation. Tosafos argues that one does not need the principal of not passing over a *mitzvah* to establish the order of donning *tefillin*. The order of the verse establishes the correct order of donning *tefillin*. The verse says, "You should bind them on your arm and it should be a sign between your eyes." The arm precedes the head.

Tosafos interprets the *Gemora* to mean when one places the *tefillin* in their bag, he should be sure to place them so he accesses the *shel yad* first. In this way he will not be in a situation where he would have to pass over the *shel rosh* in order to take the *shel yad* first. The Shulchan Aruch rules like this Tosafos and says when putting *tefillin* away, one should put the *shel yad* on top of the *shel rosh*.

The Magen Avraham has a problem, however, with the simple reading of the Shulchan Aruch. He asks how one is allowed to put the *shel yad* on top of the *shel rosh* being that the *shel rosh* has more *kedushah*. In general we have a rule which forbids the placing of something of lesser *kedushah* on top of something with more *kedushah*. Therefore, the Magen Avraham suggests that one should make a wide bag in order that both *tefillin* should be on the same level. This is our custom. He explains the words of the Shulchan Aruch by saying the *shel yad* should be slightly elevated in order to insure that one takes it before he takes the *shel rosh*.

It is also brought in the poskim that one should have a designated side where he places each of the *tefillin* in order not to accidentally take the wrong one and create a situation where he would have to pass over a *mitzvah*.

DAILY MASHAL

Lighting Shabbos Candles on the Table where we Eat

The *Gemora* states that the Menorah and the Shulchan in the Bais HaMikdash must see each other. The *halachah* is that the Shabbos candles should be lit where one eats the Shabbos meal. Perhaps the idea is that the Menorah symbolizes wisdom and spirituality, and the Shulchan symbolizes materialism. By placing the Menorah opposite the Shulchan, and by placing the Shabbos lights on the Shabbos table, we are demonstrating that even our physical pleasures are synthesized with our spiritual endeavors.