

16 Sivan 5781
May 27, 2021



Yoma Daf 46

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

Rabbi Elozar said in the name of Bar Kappara: Rabbi Meir was saying: a separate fire was made on the Altar to burn the limbs of the olah sacrifices which were left over from the night before, and even on the Shabbos.

The *Gemora* asks: Aren't we told the same thing explicitly in the Mishnah? Every day there were four pyres. Rabbi Avin answers that Bar Kappara comes to teach us that we make a separate fire even for disqualified sacrifices.¹

The *Gemora* gives two different versions for this halachah. In the first version, in order to warrant a separate fire, these *passul* sacrifices must have been partially burnt during the night, but if the fire had not yet taken hold of them, a special pyre is not arranged for them.² Others say: Whether they were valid or invalid [the same rule applies]: If the fire had taken hold of them, a special pyre is arranged, but if not, not.

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.³

Rav Acha bar Yaakov answers that it was necessary, for you might have thought that the Mishnah was speaking of Yom Kippur that followed Shabbos, for the fats of Shabbos could

be burnt on Yom Kippur. There is no indication, however, that one can kindle a new fire on Yom Kippur to burn weekday sacrifices that weren't consumed during its proper day. Therefore, it was necessary for Bar Kappara to teach this *halachah*.

Rava said: Who is it that does not care what flour he grinds? Have we not learnt: On all other days?⁴ This is a real difficulty. Now Rav Huna disagrees [with Rava and Bar kappara], for he said: The tamid offering overrides the Shabbos only at its beginning, but not at its end.⁵ (46a1 – 46a2)

The text stated: Rav Huna teaches, "The beginning overrides and the end does not override."

What does not override? [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 said: it overrides the Shabbos, but it

¹ 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.

² A separate fire for valid sacrifices, however, can be made even if the limbs were not burnt at all during the night.

³ Since Yom Kippur has the same prohibition regarding fire as Shabbos, we can assume that this extra fire was kindled on Shabbos as well!?

⁴ Which includes the Shabbos.

⁵ This offering is sacrificed on the Shabbos day, notwithstanding the fact that the labor involved many kinds of work expressly forbidden on that day. The beginning, i.e., the slaughtering, the sprinkling of the blood and the offering of the parts may be done on the Shabbos. The end, i.e., the Friday offering, however, may not be offered on the Shabbos. Since it belongs to Friday, it would be desecration to continue it on the Shabbos.

does not override tumah.⁶ Rabbah said: it overrides *tumah*, but not *Shabbos*.⁷

Abaye said to Rabbah: There is a difficulty on your view as well as on the view of Rav Chisda. According to you, there is a difficulty: Why does it suspend the law of tumah? Because Scripture said: In its appointed time, i.e., even in a state of tumah, [it should suspend also] the Shabbos, [since] 'in its appointed time' [implies] even on the Shabbos? — And according to Rav Chisda there is a difficulty. What is the difference [regarding the law in the case of] Shabbos, where it is written: 'In its appointed time' [i.e.,] even on the Shabbos; the same should apply to tumah, since 'In its appointed time' [implies] even in a state of tumah. He answered: There is no difficulty according to my view, nor is there any difficulty according to Rav Chisda. There is no difficulty on my view; for the beginning is like the end [consequently] in the case of the law of tumah, since it is suspended at the beginning it is also suspended at the end, but with regard to the Shabbos, since it is not suspended at the beginning, it is also not suspended at the end.⁸ Nor is there any difficulty according to Rav Chisda: He does not hold that the end is like the beginning: [consequently] with regard to the Shabbos, since it is inoperative when a community sacrifice is concerned, it is suspended also at the end of the sacrifice, whereas as regards the law of tumah, since in the face of a community sacrifice it is only suspended, it is suspended only at the beginning which is essential for [the obtainment of] atonement, but not at the end, which is not essential for atonement.⁹ (46a2 – 46b1)

⁶ Rav Chisda understood that Rav Huna's ruling 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.

⁷ The parts of the tamid offering may be offered even in a state of tumah, but Friday's tamid may not be offered on the Shabbos.

[There is a prohibition to extinguish a fire on the Altar. The fire for the Menorah and the incense was taken from the Altar. 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.] It was stated: If one extinguished the fire of [for] the incense shovel or of [for] the Menorah, Abaye holds that he is liable. Rava holds that he is not.

[There are two versions to this argument.] If it was extinguished on the top of the Altar,¹⁰ everyone agrees that he is liable. The disagreement is in the situation where the coal was brought to the floor of the Temple Courtyard. Abaye holds him liable 'because it is fire of the Altar'; whereas Rava holds him not liable, 'since it was removed, it has been removed.'

The Gemara asks: According to whose opinion will be, then, what Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: 'One who takes an ember down from the Altar and puts it out is liable' shall we say it will be in accord with Abaye? — You may also say that it is in accord with Rava, for in the one case it was not removed for its assigned use,¹¹ in the other case it was removed from the altar for its assigned use.

There are those who say: All agree regarding the case where he took it down to the floor and extinguished it there that he is not liable; the dispute concerns but the case where he extinguished it on the top of the Altar. Abaye holds he is

⁸ Regarding *tumah*, the laws of *tumah* have already – by the offering of its blood – 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, for we may not slaughter or throw the blood of Friday's tamid on the Shabbos; it, therefore, would not be proper to violate Shabbos for the purpose of burning the leftover limbs.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ The coal is still on the top of the Altar.

¹¹ And therefore is still regarded as "the fire of the Altar."



liable 'because it is the top of the Altar', whereas Rava holds that he is not liable, 'since he removed it, he has removed it'.

The Gemara asks: According to whose opinion will be, then, what Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: 'One who takes an ember down from the Altar and puts it out is liable' shall we say that it accords neither with Abaye, nor with that of Rava? — 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. Here, it was removed for its assigned purpose.¹² (46b1 – 46b2)

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.

¹² 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.