

שיטת רבי – רבי אליעזר ורבי עקיבא – The opinions of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva – **אליעזר ורבי עקיבא**: Some commentaries suggest that Rabbi Akiva's statement here is to be read as a parenthetical comment within the statement of Rabbi Eliezer, highlighting the major point of dispute between the two opinions. As such, the continuation of the mishna should be read as a continuation of Rabbi Eliezer's statement. Accordingly, the statements of both Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva in the mishna strongly parallel their statements as recorded in the *baraita* and *Tosefta* that are quoted by the Gemara (Rav Shmuel Strashun; see *Toledot Yitzhak*).

In the Jerusalem Talmud a third opinion on the matter is cited, namely that of the Rabbis. They disagree with both Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva and hold that all of the offerings are sacrificed together with the afternoon daily offering.

ויום טוב היה עושה – And he would make a feast – **ויום טוב היה עושה**: Some explain that he made this feast the day after Yom Kippur, which is why some refer to the day after Yom Kippur as *Simhat Kohan*, the Priest's Joy (see Rabbeinu Yehonatan and *Me'iri*).

שיצא בשלום – When he emerged in peace – **שיצא בשלום**: This was a cause for celebration. The service had been completed with neither the High Priest being disqualified nor any harm befalling him while inside the Holy of Holies (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

BACKGROUND

ולקטיב את הנרות – And to remove the ashes from the lamps –



Priest removing the ashes from the lamps

ויצא ועשה את אילו ואת איל העם, ואת שבעת בבשים תמימים בני שנה, דברי רבי אליעזר, ורבי עקיבא אומר: עם תמיד של שחר היו קרבין, ופר העולה ושעיר הנעשה בחוץ היו קרבין עם תמיד של בין הערבים.

The mishna addresses those offerings whose sacrifice has still not been mentioned. The verses in Leviticus, chapter 16, detail the special offerings of the atonement service of Yom Kippur. Of those offerings, the ram of the High Priest and the ram of the people have still not been addressed. In addition to this, the additional offerings of Yom Kippur detailed in Numbers, chapter 29, have not yet been discussed. These include seven one-year-old lambs and a bull to be brought as a burnt-offering and a goat to be brought as a sin-offering. The mishna continues: **He emerged and offered his ram and the ram of the people and the seven unblemished year-old lambs mandated to be offered that day. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Akiva says:** Those offerings were not sacrificed at this point; rather, they were sacrificed with the daily morning offering; and the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering; and the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, were sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering.^N

קדש ידיו ורגליו ופשט, ורד וטבל, ועלה ונסתפג.

After sacrificing these offerings, he sanctified his hands and feet and removed the golden garments, and he descended into the ritual bath and immersed and ascended and dried himself.

הביאו לו בגדי לבן ולבש, וקדש ידיו ורגליו, ונכנס להוציא את הכף ואת המחתה. קדש ידיו ורגליו, ופשט ורד וטבל, עלה ונסתפג.

They brought him the white garments again, and he dressed in them and sanctified his hands and feet. Afterward he entered the Holy of Holies to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan, which he had brought there earlier. He again sanctified his hands and feet and removed the white garments and descended to the ritual bath and immersed and ascended and dried himself with a towel.

הביאו לו בגדי זהב ולבש, וקדש ידיו ורגליו, ונכנס להקטיר קטורת של בין הערבים, ולהטיב את הנרות. וקדש ידיו ורגליו ופשט, ורד וטבל עלה ונסתפג.

They brought him the golden garments, and he dressed in them and sanctified his hands and feet and entered the Sanctuary to burn the afternoon incense and to remove the ashes from the lamps,^B which signified the end of the day's service. And he sanctified his hands and feet and removed the golden garments, and he descended to the ritual bath and immersed and ascended and dried himself.

הביאו לו בגדי עצמו ולבש, ומליון אותו עד ביתו, ויום טוב היה עושה לואהביו בשעה שיצא בשלום מן הקודש.

They then brought him his own clothing and he dressed, since the service was complete and Yom Kippur was over; and the people escort him to his house in deference to him. And the High Priest would make a feast^N for his loved ones and his friends when he emerged in peace^N from the Sanctuary.

גמ' איבעיא להו: היכי קאמר? עם תמיד של שחר היו קרבין, ופר העולה ושעיר הנעשה בחוץ עם תמיד של בין הערבים,

GEMARA It was taught in the mishna: Rabbi Akiva said the seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering; and the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering; and the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, with the daily afternoon offering. It is unclear whether the middle clause concerning the bull should be read as a continuation of the first clause, or as relating to the latter clause. The Gemara seeks to clarify this ambiguity. **A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is Rabbi Akiva saying?** Does he mean to say the seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering, whereas the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering and the goat whose services are performed outside were sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering?

או דילמא הכי קאמר: עם תמיד של שחר היו קרבין ופר העולה בהדיניהו, ושעיר הנעשה בחוץ – עם תמיד של בין הערבים,

Or perhaps this is what he is saying: The seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering and the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering together with them, whereas the goat whose services are performed outside, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, was sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering.

ותו: פר העולה לרבי אליעזר דשייריה, אימת עביד ליה?

And furthermore, another dilemma: With regard to the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering, according to Rabbi Eliezer's opinion: Since he omitted mention of it, it must be clarified when the High Priest performs its sacrifice. Is it sacrificed at this point in the day, or at another time?

NOTES

Order of the service – סדר העבודה: There are many different opinions concerning the exact order of all the services on Yom Kippur. See the Halakha note for the opinion of the Rambam. It would appear that Tosafot concur with this view. Rabbeinu Yehonatan, Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi, and the author of the Meiri all rule that the daily afternoon offering was sacrificed only at the fifth immersion. It is stated in The Jerusalem Talmud that the High Priest first sacrifices all the sin-offerings, including those of the additional offerings of the day, and afterward he sacrifices all the burnt-offerings.

HALAKHA

Conclusion of the day's service – סיום עבודת היום: After the High Priest reads from the Torah and recites his blessings, he removes his white garments and immerses and dons the golden garments. He sanctifies his hands and feet and sacrifices the goat for a sin-offering which is the Festival's additional offering, and his ram and the people's ram. He burns the sacrificial parts of the bull and the goat and sacrifices the daily afternoon offering. He undresses and immerses and dons the white garments and sanctifies himself. He then removes the spoon and coal pan from the Holy of Holies. He immerses and dons the golden garments and sanctifies himself and burns the incense of the afternoon. He sanctifies his hands and feet, takes off the golden garments and dons his own clothing. He leaves for his home accompanied by the people, who escort him (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 4:2).

Perek VII
Daf 70 Amud b

NOTES

Besides the sin-offering of atonement – מלבד תטאת הכפורים: This phrase is superfluous, because it is obvious that one sin-offering cannot be substituted for the other. The Gemara therefore explains that it teaches an additional matter, either regarding the timing of the offering or regarding the nature of its atonement (Ritva).

For what this one atones, that one atones – מה שזה מכפר זה – מכפר: Both offerings atone for unwitting violations of the ritual purity of the Temple, e.g., if one entered the Temple while ritually impure. There are several circumstances in which such a violation can occur. With regard to a person who was initially aware of his impurity but then forgot and entered the Temple, if he becomes aware of the violation he brings a sliding-scale sin-offering. If he was originally aware of his impurity but then forgot and entered the Temple and did not later become aware of the violation, he achieves atonement through the inner sin-offering of Yom Kippur, i.e., the sin-offering whose blood was sprinkled inside the Holy of Holies. If he was originally unaware of his impurity and entered the Temple but then learned of his impurity, the outer goat of Yom Kippur, i.e., the sin-offering whose blood was sprinkled upon the altar in the Temple courtyard, atones for his transgression (see Meiri).

ותו: בין לרבי אליעזר בין לרבי עקיבא אימורי תטאת אימת עביד להו?

אמר רבא: לא משכחת לה מתקנתא אלא או לרבי אליעזר דתנא בדבי שמואל, או לרבי עקיבא דתוספתא.

דתנא דבי שמואל, רבי אליעזר אומר: יצא ועשה אילו ואיל העם ואימורי תטאת, אבל פר העולה ושבעת כבשים ושעיר הנעשה בחוץ – עם תמיד של בין הערבים.

רבי עקיבא דתוספתא מאי היא – דתנא, רבי עקיבא אומר: פר העולה ושבעת כבשים עם תמיד של שחר הוי קרבין, שנאמר: "מלבד עולת הבקר אשר לעולת התמיד." ואחר כך עבודת היום

And furthermore, another dilemma: According to both Rabbi Eliezer's opinion and according to Rabbi Akiva's opinion, since neither of them mentioned the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar, it must be clarified when the High Priest performs their service and places them on the altar.

Rava said: You will only find it properly explained either according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer as taught by the school of Shmuel, or according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva as taught in the Tosefta.

The school of Shmuel taught that Rabbi Eliezer says: He came out and offered his ram and the ram of the people and the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar. But the bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering and the seven lambs and the goat whose services are performed outside were sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering.

What is Rabbi Akiva's opinion as taught in the Tosefta? As it was taught that Rabbi Akiva says: The bull of the Yom Kippur burnt-offering and the seven lambs were sacrificed with the daily morning offering, as it is stated with regard to the additional offerings of other Festivals: "Besides the morning burnt-offering which is the daily burnt-offering you shall sacrifice these" (Numbers 28:23), indicating that the additional offerings of the day should be sacrificed together with the daily offering. And afterward the service of the day, which is unique to Yom Kippur, is performed.^{NH}

ואחר כך שעיר הנעשה בחוץ, שנאמר: "שעיר עזים אחד תטאת מלבד תטאת הכפורים," ואחר כך אילו ואיל העם, ואחר כך אימורי תטאת, ואחר כך תמיד של בין הערבים.

מאי טעמא דרבי אליעזר? עביד בדבתיב, עביד ברישא דתורת בהמים, והדר עביד דחומש הפקודים.

ורבי עקיבא – דדקתני טעמא: "מלבד עולת הבקר אשר לעולת התמיד" אלמא: מוספין עם תמיד של שחר עביד להו.

ורבי אליעזר, האי "מלבד תטאת הכפורים" מאי עביד ליה? ההוא מיבעי ליה: על מה שזה מכפר זה מכפר.

And afterward, the goat whose services are performed outside is sacrificed, as it is stated: "One goat for a sin-offering besides the sin-offering of atonement" and the daily burnt-offering, and its meal-offering, and their libations" (Numbers 29:11), indicating that the goat sin-offering is sacrificed after the other offerings of the day. And afterward he offers his ram and the ram of the people, and afterward he places upon the altar the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar, and afterward he sacrifices the daily afternoon offering.

What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer? The High Priest acts in accordance with the order in which it is written in the Torah: First he performs the services described in Leviticus, and afterward he performs the additional offerings mentioned in the book of Numbers.

And what is Rabbi Akiva's reasoning? His reasoning is that as the Tosefta teaches that the verse states: "Besides the morning burnt-offering which is the daily burnt-offering you shall sacrifice these" (Numbers 28:23), it is apparent that the sacrifice of the additional offerings should be performed together with the daily morning offering.

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Eliezer, what does he do with this verse: "Besides the sin-offering of atonement," which was the basis for Rabbi Akiva's opinion? That verse is necessary for him to derive from it that for what this one, the goat sin-offering whose blood is sprinkled inside the Holy of Holies, atones, that one, the goat sin-offering of the additional offerings whose services are performed in the Temple courtyard, also atones.^N

וַיֵּצֵא וְעִשָּׂה – וַיֵּצֵא וְעִשָּׂה: In addition, it is apparently also derived from here that all the other burnt-offerings are also sacrificed with these burnt-offerings (Rabbi Yehuda Bakhrakh).

Lest he be negligent – דִּילְמָא פִּשְׁעֵי: There is no suggestion here that the High Priest will purposely disregard his duties or forget to perform them, as is usually implied by this phrase. Such a concern would be misplaced when dealing with the High Priest. Rather, the concern is that he may lack the necessary strength to complete everything. Therefore, due to the importance of the unique Yom Kippur service, it is given priority over the additional offerings, which might ultimately, due to his weakness, not be brought at all (*Siah Yitzhak*).

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר מִשְׁמוֹ: אֶחָד קָרַב עִם תְּמִיד שֶׁל שָׁחַר, וְשֵׁשׁ עִם תְּמִיד שֶׁל בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים. רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן אוֹמֵר מִשְׁמוֹ: שֵׁשׁ קָרְבִין עִם תְּמִיד שֶׁל שָׁחַר, וְאֶחָד עִם תְּמִיד שֶׁל בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים.

The *Tosefta* cited above, which recorded the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, also records additional versions of his view: **Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Akiva: One of the seven lambs is sacrificed with the daily morning offering, and the other six are sacrificed with the daily afternoon offering. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says in the name of Rabbi Akiva: Six are sacrificed with the daily morning offering and one with the daily afternoon offering.**

מֵאֵי טַעְמֵיהוּ דְרַבְנָן? תְּרֵי קְרָאֵי בְּתַיְבֵי: בְּתַיְבֵי: "מִלְּבַד עוֹלַת הַבֶּקֶר" וּבְתַיְבֵי: "וַיֵּצֵא וְעִשָּׂה אֶת עוֹלָתוֹ." הֲלִכְךָ, עֲבִיד מַנְיֵיהוּ הֶכָּא, וּמַנְיֵיהוּ הֶכָּא.

What is the rationale of the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, who divide the sacrifice of the seven lambs into two parts? Two verses are written that suggest different times at which the additional offerings are sacrificed: It is written with regard to the additional offerings: "Besides the morning burnt-offering which is the daily burnt-offering you shall sacrifice these" (Numbers 28:23), implying that the additional offerings are sacrificed in the morning. But it is also written that upon concluding the service of the day: "And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering" and the burnt-offering of the people" (Leviticus 16:24). As the phrase: "The burnt-offering of the people," is referring to the additional offerings, this verse implies that the additional offerings are sacrificed in the afternoon. Therefore, in order to fulfill both verses, he performs the sacrifice of some of them here, in the morning, and some of them there, in the afternoon.

בְּמֵאֵי קָא מִפְּלַגִּי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה סְבַר: עֲבִיד חַד, בְּדַכְתֵּיב: "מִלְּבַד עוֹלַת הַבֶּקֶר", וְהַדְר עֲבִיד עֲבוּדַת הַיּוֹם, דִּילְמָא חוֹלְשָׁא תְּלִישׁ בְּהוּן גְּדוּל.

With regard to what do Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Elazar disagree? Rabbi Yehuda holds that the High Priest performs the sacrifice of one lamb in the morning, as it is written: "Besides the morning burnt-offering," and then he performs the service of the day before he proceeds to sacrifice the other six lambs. Initially, only the minimum possible number of lambs is sacrificed lest the High Priest become weak by doing more. He might then be unable to complete the service of the day, which cannot be performed by anyone else and without which atonement cannot be achieved.

וְרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן סְבַר: בֵּין דְּאַתְחִיל – עֲבִיד שְׁשָׁה, דִּילְמָא פִּשְׁעֵי דְלִגְבֵי עֲבוּדַת הַיּוֹם זְרִיז הוּא.

And Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, holds: Since he has begun to sacrifice the lambs he performs the sacrifice of six of them, leaving over only one until the afternoon. He sacrifices the maximum possible number of lambs now lest he be negligent^N later and fail to sacrifice so many at the close of the day. There is no concern that by doing so he might become weak and be unable to perform the service of the day, because with regard to the service of the day, the High Priest is diligent and will always muster the energy needed.

דְּכוּלֵי עֲלָמָא מִיהַת תַּד אִיל הוּא, כְּמֵאן – כְּרַבִּי. דְּתַנַּי: רַבִּי אוֹמֵר: אִיל אֶחָד הָאָמּוֹר כָּאן, הוּא הָאָמּוֹר בְּחֻמְשָׁא הַפְּקוּדִים. רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן אוֹמֵר: שְׁנֵי אִילִים הֵן, אֶחָד הָאָמּוֹר כָּאן, וְאֶחָד הָאָמּוֹר בְּחֻמְשָׁא הַפְּקוּדִים.

The Gemara notes: Despite their disagreements, **everyone** agrees, however, that there is only **one ram** for the people. **In accordance with whose opinion is this?** It is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As it was taught** in a *baraita* that **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Only one ram for the people is sacrificed, as the one stated here** in Leviticus: "With this shall Aaron come into the Sanctuary: With a young bull for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 16:3), **is the same one that is stated in the Book of Numbers:** "And you shall sacrifice a burnt-offering to the Lord of pleasing odor: One young bull, one ram, seven unblemished year-old lambs shall be unto you" (Numbers 29:8). **Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: There are two rams for the people: One that is stated here** in Leviticus, which is part of the service of the day, **and one stated in the Book of Numbers**, which is part of the day's additional offerings.

מֵאֵי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי? דְּתַיְבֵי "אֶחָד." וְרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן: מֵאֵי "אֶחָד" – מִיּוֹחַד שְׁבַעֲדָרוּ.

What is the rationale of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? As it is written: "One," implying one ram, not two. And according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, what is the meaning of "one"?: "One" indicates that the ram used should be the unique one, i.e., the best, of its flock.

NOTES

Your choice vows – מכחר נדרין: Certainly it is prohibited to sacrifice an animal with a blemish or another explicitly stated disqualification. Similarly, some animals, such as old or filthy animals, are considered inappropriate for use. The Gemara here teaches that even an animal that is otherwise fit to be used should be rejected if there is a superior specimen in the flock (see *Me'iri*).

ורבי – נפקא ליה מ"מבחר נדרין".
ורבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון: חד בחובה
וחד בנדבה, וצריכי.

And from where does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derive the requirement that the ram be of the best stock? He derives it from the verse: "Your choice vows" (Deuteronomy 12:11),^N which teaches that all offerings must be from the choicest animals. And according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, why is this additional verse necessary? One verse refers to obligatory offerings, and the other one refers to free-will offerings. And both are necessary because the requirement in one case cannot be learned from the other. It is reasonable that a free-will offering must be from the choicest animal since it is a voluntary gift; and it is also reasonable that an obligatory offering should be the choicest, since an obligation must be fulfilled in the finest possible way.

"קידש ידיו ורגליו". תנו רבנן:
"ובא אהרן אל אהל מועד", למה
הוא בא – להוציא את הכף ואת
המחטתה.

§ It was taught in the mishna: The High Priest sanctified his hands and feet and entered the Holy of Holies to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan. The Gemara cites a related *baraita*. The Sages taught: The verse states: "And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting" (Leviticus 16:23), which is taken to mean that he enters the Holy of Holies. Why does he come? He comes in order to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan

Perek VII
Daf 71 Amud a

NOTES

The whole portion is written in order – שָׁבַל הַפְּרָשָׁה בְּיָמָהּ – נְאֻמָּה עַל הַסֵּדֶר: If indeed the High Priest reenters the Holy of Holies only later, why does the Torah mention his entry at this point, out of sequence? The Vilna Gaon explains that according to the *Sifra*, Aaron, the first High Priest, was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies throughout the year provided he observed the order of the service described in Leviticus, chapter 16. When the order of the verses is followed, it emerges that Aaron was able to enter the Holy of Holies with just three immersions. This was true throughout the year. However, on Yom Kippur itself, in order to achieve the requisite number of five immersions, the reentry had to be delayed, as described by the Gemara (*Hokhmat Adam*).

שָׁבַל הַפְּרָשָׁה בְּיָמָהּ – נְאֻמָּה עַל
הַסֵּדֶר, חוּץ מִפְּסוּקֵי זֶה.

as the whole portion of the service of the day detailed in Leviticus is written in this order,^N and the service must be performed in that order, except for this verse, which is stated out of order and is performed only later. The verse detailing his reentry (Leviticus 16:23) is written before the verse detailing the sacrifice of the rams (Leviticus 16:24), but in fact the reentry occurs only after the sacrifice of the rams.

מאי טעמא? אָמַר רב חסדא: גְּמִירַי
חֲמֵשׁ טְבִילוֹת וְעֶשְׂרֵה קִידּוּשֵׁי טוֹבֵל
בְּהַן גְּדוּל וּמְקַדֵּשׁ בּו בַּיּוֹם.

The Gemara asks: What is the reason to assume this verse is written out of order? Rav Hisda said: They learned as a tradition that the High Priest performs five immersions and ten sanctifications^H of his hands and feet when he changes clothing on that day. Each time the High Priest changes between the white and golden garments, he sanctifies his hands and feet, immerses, dresses in the new set of garments and then once again sanctifies his hands and feet.

HALAKHA

Five immersions and ten sanctifications – חֲמֵשׁ טְבִילוֹת – עֶשְׂרֵה קִידּוּשֵׁי: The oral tradition teaches that on Yom Kippur the High Priest performs five immersions and sanctifies his hands and feet ten times. The mishna details their order and position within the service (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 2:2).

וְאִי אָמַרְתָּ בְּסֵדֶרְךָ בְּתִיבֵי – לֹא
מִשְׁבַּחְתָּ לָּהּ אֲלֵא שְׁלֹשׁ טְבִילוֹת
וְשֵׁשׁ קִידּוּשֵׁי.

And if you say that the verses, including this one, are written in order, you find only three immersions and six sanctifications. Read in order, the verses indicate only three changes of garments, which involve three immersions and six sanctifications. In order to arrive at the requisite numbers of five immersions and ten sanctifications one must assume that the High Priest's reentry into the Holy of Holies takes place at a later time, after he has already changed into the golden garments. This would require him to change into the white garments and then back into the golden garments, providing an additional two immersions and four sanctifications.

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבִּי זְעֵרָא: וְדִילְמָא מִפְּסִיק
לִיה בְּשַׁעֲרֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בְּחוּץ!

Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this: But perhaps the order of the verses in Leviticus can be maintained, and the requisite number of immersions and sanctifications still achieved, if he interrupts the service performed in the white garments with the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, and are performed in the golden garments. The sacrifice of the goat is not mentioned in Leviticus but only in Numbers. Therefore, it could be inserted into the service of the day without compromising the order of the verses in Leviticus. The change into the golden garments and then back into the white garments would contribute an additional two immersions and four sanctifications, thus arriving at the requisite numbers.

אָמַר אַבְיָי אָמַר קָרָא, "וַיֵּצֵא וְעָשָׂה
אֶת עוֹלֹתָיו" מִצִּיּוֹאָה רֵאשׁוֹנָה עִבִּיד
אֵילֹו וְאֵילֹו הָעֵם.

Abaye said: It is clear that the verse detailing the reentry must be out of order, since **the verse states: "And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people"** (Leviticus 16:24). This is the first exit stated in the verses and implies that immediately **following his first exit** from the Holy of Holies, **he performs the sacrifice of his ram and the ram of the people** without any other interruption. If so, the reentry must occur only afterward.

רַבָּא אָמַר אָמַר קָרָא, "וּפָשַׁט אֶת
בְּגָדֵי הַבְּדֵי שֶׁאֵין תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "אֲשֶׁר
לָבַשׁ, כְּלוּם אָדָם פּוֹשֵׁט אֶלֶּא מֵה
שְׁלוּבֵשׁ? אֶלֶּא מֵה תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר
"אֲשֶׁר לָבַשׁ" – שְׁלֵבֵשׁ כְּבָר.

Rava said a different proof. **The verse states: "And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments"** which he wore when he went into the Sanctuary" (Leviticus 16:23). Now, **the verse does not need to state "which he wore,"** as this is obvious; can one remove anything other than what he is wearing? **Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states "which he wore"?** It is referring to those garments which he had already worn previously, removed, and then worn again. It is therefore apparent that this verse occurs at a point when he had already changed out of the white garments and into the golden garments. Perforce, then, it must be out of order.

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּא בְּרַב שִׁילָא: וְאִמָּא
דְּמַפְסִיק לִיה בְּשַׁעִיר הַנֶּעֱשֶׂה בַּחוּץ!
הִכְתִּיב "וַיֵּצֵא וְעָשָׂה".

Rabba bar Rav Sheila strongly objects to this: Say that the order of the verses can be maintained, and the requisite number of immersions and sanctifications achieved, if **he interrupts** the services performed in the white garments **with the goat** whose services are performed outside and are performed in the golden garments. This would provide the additional two immersions and four sanctifications required. The Gemara answers: **Isn't it written: "And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people"** (Leviticus 16:24), which implies that immediately following his first exit he performs the sacrifice of his ram and the ram of the people and the reentry to the Holy of Holies occurs only later.

וְכָל הַפְּרָשָׁה בּוֹלָה נְאֻמָּה עַל הַסְּדֵר?
וְהָא קָרָאֵי בְּתִיבֵי: "וְאֶת חֶלֶב הַחֲטָאתַי
וְקִטְוֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ", וְהָדָר: "וְאֶת פֶּרֶ
הַחֲטָאתַי וְאֶת שְׁעִיר הַחֲטָאתַי". וְאֵילֹו
אֲנִי תַנּוּ: הַרְוָאָה אֶת כַּהֵן גְּדוֹל בְּשָׂהוּא
קוֹרָא אֵינוּ רוֹאָה פֶּרֶ וְשַׁעִיר הַנֶּשְׂרָפִין,
וְאֵילֹו אִמּוּרֵי חֲטָאתַי בְּתֵר הֵכִי מִקְטִיר
לָהּ!

The Gemara questions the premise of the *baraita*: **Is the entire passage really written in order? But among the verses it is written: "And he shall burn the fat of the sin-offering upon the altar"** (Leviticus 16:25), and then in a later verse it is written: **"And the bull of the sin-offering, and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought to make atonement in the Sanctuary, shall be carried outside the camp; and they shall burn..."** (Leviticus 16:27). Yet we learned in the mishna: **One who sees the High Priest reading the Torah does not see the bull and goat that are burned,** which are referred to in verse 27, **while** according to all opinions concerning the order of the day, **the portions of the sin-offering** to be consumed on the altar, which are mentioned in verse 25, **are burned only afterward.** Therefore, it is apparent that these verses are also not in order.

אִמָּא: חוּץ מִפְּסוּקֵי זֶה וְאֵילָן.

The Gemara answers: Say that the intent of the *baraita* is that the verses are not in order **except for this verse and onward.**

וּמֵאֵי חֲזוּתֵי דְּמִשְׁבֵּשֵׁת קָרָאֵי? שְׁבִישׁ
מִתְנַתָּא!

The Gemara asks: **And what did you see that you preferred to rearrange the order of the verses?** Instead, rearrange the order in the mishna.

אָמַר אַבְיָי, אָמַר קָרָא: "וְהַמְשַׁלַּח
וְהַשּׂוֹרֵף" מֵה מְשַׁלַּח – דְּמַעֲקָרָא,
אֶף שּׂוֹרֵף דְּמַעֲקָרָא.

Abaye said: It is clear that the verse detailing the burning of the remains of the bull is out of order, since **the verse states: "And the one who sends the goat to Azazel"** (Leviticus 16:26), and then states: **"And the one who burns them"** (Leviticus 16:28). The repeated use of the phrase "And the one who..." indicates that **just as the one who sends the goat to Azazel does so earlier,** before the portions of the sin-offering are placed on the altar to be consumed, **so too, the one who burns the remains of the bull and goat does so earlier,** even though the verse detailing this burning is written after the verse detailing the burning of the portions of the sin-offering.

אֲדַרְבֵּיהּ, מֵה שּׂוֹרֵף דְּהַשְּׁתָּא, אֶף
מְשַׁלַּח דְּהַשְּׁתָּא!

The Gemara rejects this: **On the contrary,** one could make the opposite claim: **Just as the one who burns the remains of the bull and goat does so now, so too, the one who sends the goat to Azazel does so only now,** after the other sacrifices.

וּפָשַׁט אֶת בְּגָדֵי – וְעָשָׂה אֶת עוֹלֹתָיו: The Gemara previously derived from this verse the obligation of the High Priest to sanctify his hands and feet when dressing and undressing. How, then, can the Gemara here derive something additional from this verse? Some explain that the first derivation was based on the juxtaposition of this verse to the next: "And he shall remove... and put on," whereas this derivation is based on the superfluous phrase within the verse (*Tosafot Yeshanim*; Ritva).

”וְהַמְשַׁלַּח” – דְּמַעֲיִקְרָא מִשְׁמַע. רָבָא אָמַר: אָמַר קָרָא ”וַיַּעֲמֵד חַי” עַד מְתֵי יְהִיא זְקוּק לַעֲמֹוד חַי – עַד שְׁעֵת כְּפָרָה, וְאִימְתֵי שְׁעֵת כְּפָרָה – בְּשַׁעֲת מִתָּן דְּמִים וְרַתֵּי לָא.

אֲתֵי מְשַׁלַּח, מִצְאֵוּ בְּשׁוּק לְבֵהֵן גְּדוּל, אֹמֵר לוֹ: אִישִׁי בֵהֵן גְּדוּל! עֲשִׂינוּ שְׁלִיחוּתְךָ. מִצְאֵוּ בְּבֵיתוֹ, אֹמֵר לוֹ: מַחִיָּה חַיִּים, עֲשִׂינוּ שְׁלִיחוּתוֹ.

אָמַר רַבָּה: כִּי מִיפְטְרֵי רַבְנָן מִהַדְרֵי בְּפִנוּמְבֵדִיתָא אָמְרֵי חַכֵּי: מַחִיָּה חַיִּים יִתֵּן לְךָ חַיִּים אַרְוָכִים וְטוֹבִים וּמְתוּקִין.

”אֲתֵהֲלֵךְ לִפְנֵי ה’ בְּאַרְצוֹת הַחַיִּים” – אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: זֶה מְקוֹם שְׁוֹקִים.

”כִּי אֲרֻךְ יָמִים וּשְׁנוֹת חַיִּים וְשָׁלוֹם יוֹסִיפוּ לְךָ.” וְכִי יֵשׁ שָׁנִים שֶׁל חַיִּים וַיֵּשׁ שָׁנִים שְׂאִינָן שֶׁל חַיִּים? אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: אֵלּוּ שְׁנוֹתָיו שֶׁל אָדָם, הַמֵּתֵהֶפְכוֹת עָלָיו מִרַעָה לְטוֹבָה.

”אֲלֵיכֶם אִישִׁים אֶקְרָא” אָמַר רַבִּי בְּרַכְיָה: אֵלּוּ תַלְמִידֵי חֻכְמַיִם, שְׂדוּמִין לְנָשִׁים וְעוֹשֵׂי גְבוּרָה כְּאֲנָשִׁים, וְאָמַר רַבִּי בְּרַכְיָה: הַרוּצָה לְנֶסֶךְ יוֹן עַל גְּבֵי הַמַּבְּבָח – יְמַלֵּא גְרוֹנָם שֶׁל תַּלְמִידֵי חֻכְמַיִם יוֹן, שְׁנֵאֲמַר ”אֲלֵיכֶם אִישִׁים אֶקְרָא.”

וְאָמַר רַבִּי בְּרַכְיָה: אִם רוּאָה אָדָם שְׂתוּרָה פּוֹסְקֵת מוֹרְעוֹ – יִשָּׂא בֵּת תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם, שְׁנֵאֲמַר: ”אִם יוֹקִין בְּאַרְץ שְׂרָשׁוֹ וּבְעֶפֶר יָמוֹת גִּזְעוֹ,

The Gemara explains a difficulty with this: The phrasing of: “**And the one who sends**” implies that it was performed earlier. Alternatively, Rava said: Sending the goat away definitely took place earlier, as the verse states: “But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him” (Leviticus 16:10). This teaches: **How long must it stand alive? It must do so until the moment of atonement. And when is the moment of atonement? It is at the moment of the presenting of the blood, but no later.** At that point it is already sent away.

§ The Gemara describes the eventual meeting between the High Priest and the one who sends the goat to Azazel: When the **one who sends the goat comes on the day following Yom Kippur, if he finds the High Priest in the market**, which is a public place, **he says to him: My Master, High Priest, we performed your mission**, i.e., we fulfilled the mitzva of sending the goat to Azazel. He refers to the sending as the High Priest’s mission as a public display of respect. But if **he finds him in his house, he says to him: The One Who grants life to the living, God, we performed His mission.**^N

Apropos the phrase: The One Who grants life to the living, Rabba said: **When the Sages take leave from one another in Pumbedita, they say as follows: May the One Who grants life to the living grant you a long, good, and established life.**

Further apropos the phrase: The One Who grants life to the living, the Gemara explains a verse using a similar phrase and then additional verses. With regard to the verse: “**I shall walk before the Lord in the lands of the living**” (Psalms 116:9),^N Rav Yehuda said: **This is the place of markets**, where food and needs can be readily obtained. King David, who wandered from place to place, prayed to always find ready sustenance.

The verse states: “**For length of days, and years of life, and peace, will they add to you**” (Proverbs 3:2). The Gemara asks: **Are there years of life and years that are not of life?** The Gemara explains: **Rabbi Elazar said: “Years of life” refers to good years.** As such, these additional years of life referred to in the verse are the **years of a person’s life which are transformed for him from bad to good.**

The verse states: “**To you men [ishim] do I call**, and my voice is to the sons of men” (Proverbs 8:4). **Rabbi Berekhya said:** The word *ishim*, although it means men, is similar to the term *isha*, woman. It may therefore be taken to refer to **these Torah scholars, who are similar to women**^N in that they are physically weak and are not engaged in many activities that other men are, **but nevertheless, they act mightily like men** when engaged in Torah study. **And Rabbi Berekhya said further about that same verse: Nowadays one who wishes to pour libations of wine over the altar should fill the throats of Torah scholars with wine, as it is stated: “To you men [ishim] do I call.”** The use of the phrase *ishim*, which is similar to *isheh*, used for the altar’s fire, suggests that scholars may be compared to the fire of the altar.

And Rabbi Berekhya said: If a person sees that Torah is ceasing^N from his children, and they are not becoming Torah scholars like himself, he should marry the daughter of a Torah scholar. This will ensure that his children from her will be raised with Torah, as it is stated: “**Though its root will grow old in the earth, and its trunk will die in the ground,**

NOTES

The One Who grants life to the living, we performed His mission – מַחִיָּה חַיִּים עֲשִׂינוּ שְׁלִיחוּתוֹ: The commentaries discuss why this particular description of God was used in this context. The Maharsha suggests that the sender contrasts his own actions with those of God: We have fulfilled His mission to kill the living, i.e., killing the goat sent to Azazel, while God, in contrast, sustains the lives of the Jewish people so they do not die. Others note the midrash that states that the person who escorted the goat would die that same year. The sender therefore uses this

appellation of God as a prayer that God should grant him life in this world or the next (*Li Lishua*; Rav Shmuel Strashun; Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto). Rabbi Elyakim interprets the phrase entirely differently. He explains that the title: Who grants life to the living, refers to the High Priest, since his prayer gives life to the nation. However, since this can easily be misunderstood, it is inappropriate to utter such an expression in public.

In the lands of the living – בְּאַרְצוֹת הַחַיִּים: King David prayed to always walk before the Lord and avoid sin, even when walk-

ing in the marketplaces, which are places of temptation and distraction (*Me’iri*; Rav Ya’akov Emden).

Who are similar to women – שְׂדוּמִין לְנָשִׁים: Another explanation for the comparison is that like women, scholars stay at home and go out to the streets only infrequently (*Me’iri*).

Torah is ceasing – תוֹרָה פּוֹסְקֵת: The Gemara describes a situation where one’s ancestors were great Torah scholars but his sons are not (*Petaḥ Einayim*).

מריח מים יפריח ועשה קציר כמו נטע.

“ויום טוב היה עושה לאוהביו”. תנו רבנן: מעשה בכהן גדול אחד שיצא מבית המקדש, והוא אזלי בולי עלמא בתריה. כיון דחזוניהו לשמעיה ואבטליון – שבקוהו לרדייה ואזלי בתר שמעיה ואבטליון.

לסוף אתו שמעיה ואבטליון לאיפטורי מיניה דכהן גדול. אמר להן: ייתון בני עממין לשלם! אמרו ליה: ייתון בני עממין לשלם – דעבדין עובדא דאהרן, ולא יתי בר אהרן לשלם – דלא עביד עובדא דאהרן.

מתני' כהן גדול משמש בשמונה בליים ויהודיוט בארבעה: בכתונת, ומכסם, ומצנפת, ואבנט. מוסף עליו כהן גדול חשן ואפוד, ומעיל וציץ. באלו נשאלין באורים ותומים, ואין נשאלין אלא למלך, ולאב בית דין, ולמי שהעביר צריך בו.

גמ' תנו רבנן: דברים שנאמר בהן “שש” – חוטן כפול ששה, “משור” – שמונה, מעיל – שנים עשר, פרוכת – עשרים וארבעה. חושן ואפוד – עשרים ושמונה.

חוטן כפול ששה מנא לן? דאמר קרא “ויעשו את הכתנת שש ואת המצנפת שש ואת פארי המגבעת שש ואת מכנסי הבר שש משור”. חמשה קראי בתניי: חד – לגופיה, דכיתנא ניהו. וחד – שיהא חוטן כפול ששה, וחד – שיהיו שורין, וחד – לשאר בגדים שלא נאמר בהן שש, וחד – לעכב.

from the scent of waterⁿ it will blossom and put forth branches like a plant” (Job 14:8–9). If the figurative trunk of one’s family is drying up through lack of Torah, he should plant himself in a place of water, i.e., a family of scholars, water being a metaphor for Torah. This will ensure that his children will blossom into Torah scholars.

It was taught in the mishna: The people escort the High Priest to his house. And he would make a feast for his loved ones. The Sages taught in a *baraita*: There was an incident involving one High Priest who exited the Holy Temple and everyone followed him. When they saw Shemaya and Avtalyon, the heads of the Sanhedrin, walking along, in deference to them they left the High Priest by himself and walked after Shemaya and Avtalyon.ⁿ

Eventually, Shemaya and Avtalyon came to take leave of the High Priest before returning to their homes. Envious of the attention they received, he angrily said to them: Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace.ⁿ Shemaya and Avtalyon descended from converts, and he scornfully drew attention to that fact. They said to him: Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace, who perform the acts of Aaron, who loved and pursued peace; and let not a descendant of Aaron come in peace, who does not perform the acts of Aaron and who speaks condescendingly to descendants of converts.

MISHNA Throughout the year the High Priest serves in eight garments, and the common priest serves in four: In a tunic and trousers and a mitreⁿ and a belt. The High Priest adds another four garments beyond those worn by the common priest: A breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a frontplate.^h When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim*. And he may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim* only on behalf of the king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. Individual inquiries are not posed to the *Urim VeTummim*.^h

GEMARA The Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to those items of the priestly vestments about which it is stated they must be made with linen [*shesh*], their threads are spun six-fold, as suggested by the use of the term *shesh*, which also means six. When the Torah states that certain items are twined,^h it means their threads are spun eight-fold. Threads used to weave the robe were spun from twelve strands. The threads of the curtain were spun from twenty-four strands. The threads used to weave the breastplate and ephod were spun from twenty-eight strands.

The Gemara asks: That the threads made from *shesh* are spun six-fold, from where do we derive this? The verse states: “And they made the tunics of linen [*shesh*] of woven work for Aaron for his sons. And the mitre of linen, and the adorning mitres of linen, and the linen [*bad*] trousers of twined linen” (Exodus 39:27–28). Five mentions of the word linen are written; four times as “*shesh*” and an additional instance of “*bad*,” both meaning linen. One mention is stated for that *halakha* itself, to teach that they should be made of linen. And one mention is written to teach that the threads should be spun six-fold, *shesh* being interpreted as six. And one mention teaches that the six strands should be spun together into one. And one mention teaches that this also applies to the other garments, even though the term *shesh* is not stated with regard to them. And one mention teaches that this requirement is indispensable and that garments not made this way are invalid.

NOTES

From the scent of water – מריח מים: The inference is made from the precise use of the phrase “from the scent of water.” Water is a metaphor for Torah. Therefore, the scent of water refers not to the Torah itself, but to something necessarily connected to it, namely the daughter of a Torah scholar (Rav Ya’akov Emden).

Walked after Shemaya and Avtalyon – אזלי בתר שמעיה – ואבטליון: The deference they showed to Shemaya and Avtalyon was in accordance with the *halakha* that the honor of a Torah scholar takes precedence even over the honor of a High Priest, unless the High Priest is himself a Torah scholar.

Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace – ייתון בני עממין לשלם: The Ritva notes that he did not explicitly mention that they were descendants of gentiles. The phrase descendants of the nations could also refer to the Jewish people, as used in the book of Judges: “After you, Benjamin, among your nations” (Judges 5:14). Still, his intentions were clear.

The common priest...and a mitre – וההודיוט...ומצנפת: In contrast to the mishna, the Torah uses different terms for the headgear of a common priest and a High Priest. That of a common priest is referred to as a *migba’at* (Exodus 28:40), and that of the High Priest is referred to as a *mitznetef* (Exodus 28:4). Whether there was any distinction between the two is a matter of debate. According to some, both were made from identical scarves, sixteen cubits long, wrapped around the head, but they differed in the way they were wrapped. The common priest’s headpiece was wrapped to form a conic hat-like shape, whereas the High Priest’s was wrapped around the head like a bandage, similar to a turban (Rambam; Ramban; *Me’iri*).

Others suggest that the two mitres were totally distinct. They explain the High Priest’s mitre as above; however, they suggest that the common priest did not wear a scarf but a fully constructed hat (Ra’avad).

HALAKHA

Priestly garments – בגדי כהונה: A common priest serves in four garments: Tunic, trousers, mitre, and belt. These garments are made of white linen, except the belt, which is made of linen and wool, and their thread is six-fold. The High Priest wears the four garments of a common priest plus four additional garments: Robe, ephod, breastplate, and frontplate (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:1–2).

For whom is the *Urim VeTummim* consulted – למי נשאלים: The *Urim VeTummim* is consulted on behalf of a king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. It is not consulted for laypeople (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 10:12).

Items about which it is stated linen...twined – דברים ששאלים בהם “משור” שש: Every place in the Torah where it says linen, it means a six-fold thread, and where it says twined, it means an eight-fold thread (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:12).

NOTES

Bad – בדר: According to *Tosafot*, the Gemara relies on the assumption that unless otherwise stated, all garments mentioned in the Torah are made from either wool or linen. Therefore, it is sufficient to establish that one of the weaves mentioned refers to linen in order to confirm that all the others do as well.

מאי משמע דהאי שש כיתנא הוא?
אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: דאמר קרא
"בדר" – דבר העולה מן הקרקע בדר
בד. ואימא עמרא! עמרא איפצולי
מיפצלא. כיתנא נמי איפצולי מפציל!
כיתנא אגב לקותיה מפציל.

רבינא אמר מהכא: "פארי פשתים
יהיו על ראשם ומכנסי פשתים יהיו
על מתניהם."

אמר ליה רב אשי: הא מקמי דאתי
יחזקאל מאן אמרה? ולטעמך. הא
דאמר רב חסדא: דבר זה מתורת
משה רבינו לא למדנו. מדברי יחזקאל
בן בוזי למדנו: "כל בן נכר ערל לב
וערל בשר לא יבא אל מקדשי" הא
מקמי דאתי יחזקאל מאן אמרה?
אלא: גמרא גמירי לה, ואתא יחזקאל
ואסמכה אקרא. הכא נמי גמרא
גמירי לה, ואתא יחזקאל ואסמכה
אקרא.

The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that this term *shesh* means linen? Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: As the verse also states: "*Bad*,"⁷ and uses it interchangeably with *shesh*. And *bad* refers to something which sprouts from the ground stalk by stalk [*bad bad*], each one by itself. This is a fitting description of flax,⁸ the plant used to produce linen, as opposed to other plants, such as cotton, whose fibers grow meshed together. The Gemara asks: And say that it refers to wool, since when it grows from the animal, each hair grows separately. The Gemara answers: Wool splits, with each hair dividing into several hairs, so it does not fully fit the description of sprouting stalk by stalk. The Gemara asks: But flax also splits into individual hairs. The Gemara answers: Flax, unlike wool, splits only when beaten.

Ravina said: We have a proof for the matter from here: The verse states: "They shall have linen [*pishtim*] mitres upon their heads, and linen trousers upon their loins" (Ezekiel 44:18). The term *pishtim* used in Ezekiel certainly refers to linen; therefore, it is clear that the terms *shesh* and *bad*, used in the Torah for the same garments, also refer to linen.

Rav Ashi said to him: But before Ezekiel came, who said this *halakha*? How was it known? Ravina retorted: And according to your reasoning, the same question could be asked with regard to that which Rav Hilda said concerning the disqualification of an uncircumcised priest from serving in the Temple: This matter we did not learn from the Torah of Moses our teacher, as it is not written explicitly in the Torah; rather, we learned it from the words of Ezekiel ben Buzi, as the verse states: "No foreigner, uncircumcised of heart or uncircumcised of flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary" (Ezekiel 44:9). One could ask here as well: Before Ezekiel came, who said this *halakha*? Rather, perforce, they learned it as a tradition and then Ezekiel came and supported it with a verse. Here, too, they learned it as a tradition and then Ezekiel came and supported it with a verse.

BACKGROUND



Flax flower



Dried flax



Traditional drying of flax



Flax fibers

Flax – כיתנא: Flax, or *Linum usitatissimum*, is an annual plant 30–100 cm tall with thin branches and sky-blue flowers. Oil can be extracted from the flax seeds and used for various purposes. Flax is among the ancient domesticated plants and its cultivation was widespread in ancient Egypt. Nowadays flax is grown mainly in areas with a mild climate. The plant's fibers, found in its stem, are used to prepare flax threads, or linen. The fibers are located mainly in the outer layer of the stalk and are composed mostly of cellulose. After the stems have been dried, the fibers are removed in a long process that includes soaking the stems until they are decomposed. The stems are then dried and beaten, after which special combs are employed to separate the fibers from the chaff.

“משזור” – שמונה, מנא לך? דכתיב: “ויעשו על שולי המעיל רמוני תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני משזור” ויליף “משזור” מפרוכת, מה להלן עשרים וארבעה דהיה כל חד וחד תמיני.

The Gemara continues to explain the *baraita*. That the use of the term **twined** implies that the thread should be spun from **eight** strands, **from where do we derive this? As it is written: “And they made upon the skirts of the robe pomegranates of sky-blue, and purple, and scarlet, twined”** (Exodus 39:24); and derive a verbal analogy from the term “twined” used in this verse and the term “twined” from the verse about the curtain: **Just as there**, with regard to the curtain, there are **twenty-four** strands, as will be explained, **so too here**, there are **twenty-four** strands in total. And since each pomegranate is made of three colors, sky-blue, purple, and scarlet, it must be **that each one of them was spun from eight** strands.

ויליף מחשן ואפוד, מה להלן עשרים ושמונה אף כאן עשרים ושמונה! דנין דבר שלא נאמר בו זהב מדבר שלא נאמר בו זהב, לאפוקי חשן ואפוד שנאמר בהן זהב. אדרבה, דנין בגד מבגד, לאפוקי פרוכת, דאהל הוא!

The Gemara challenges this derivation: **Let us derive** the number of strands instead **from the breastplate and ephod** and say: **Just as there**, with regard to the breastplate and ephod, there are **twenty-eight** strands, **so too, here** there are **twenty-eight** strands. The Gemara answers: It is preferable to **derive** the *halakhot* of an item, i.e., the pomegranates, **with regard to which the use of gold threads is not stated**, from the *halakhot* of an item, i.e., the curtain, **with regard to which the use of gold threads is also not stated**. This would come to **exclude** the possibility of deriving them from the **breastplate and ephod, with regard to which the use of gold threads is stated**. The Gemara asks: **On the contrary**, it should be preferable to **derive** the *halakhot* of one **garment from another garment**, i.e., the *halakhot* of the robe from the *halakhot* of the breastplate and ephod. This would come to **exclude** the possibility of deriving them from the **curtain, which is a tent**, i.e., part of the Temple building, and not a garment. The Gemara accepts that the derivation is flawed.

אלא: דנין מאבנט, ודנין בגד ודבר שלא נאמר בו זהב, מבגד ודבר שלא נאמר בו זהב, ואין דנין דבר שאין בו זהב מדבר שיש בו זהב.

Rather, the need for thread of eight strands is **derived from the belt**, which had twenty-four threads in total, and a garment and an item with regard to which the use of gold thread is **not stated**, i.e., the pomegranates, **are derived from a garment and an item with regard to which the use of gold thread is not stated**. And an item with no gold, such as the pomegranates and robe, is **not derived from an item that has gold in it**, such as the breastplate and ephod.

רב מרי אמר: “תעשנו” כתיב, “תעשנו” – לזה ולא לאחר.

Rav Mari said another reason not to derive the number of strands in a pomegranate from the breastplate and ephod: “Like the work of the ephod **you shall make it**” (Exodus 28:15) is written with regard to the breastplate to indicate that **you shall make it**, i.e., the breastplate, like the ephod, which indicates that **for this**, i.e., the breastplate, you shall use thread of twenty-eight strands, and **not for anything else**.

רב אשי אמר: “ועשית” כתיב, שיהיו כל עשיות שוות, והיכי נעביד? נעביד תלתא דעשרה עשרה – הוו להו תלתין, נעביד תרי דתשעה תשעה וחד דעשרה – אומר קרא: “ועשית” שיהיו כל עשיותיו שוות.

Rav Ashi said another reason that there could not be twenty-eight strands in a pomegranate: “**And you shall make** pomegranates of sky-blue, and of purple, and of scarlet” (Exodus 28:33) is written to indicate **that all the makings of it must be equal**, i.e., that each color thread should be made from the same number of strands. However, if there are twenty-eight strands in total, the three threads, each of a different color, cannot be made with an equal number of strands, as **how should we do it? Let us make three** colored threads of **ten** strands each; then they are **thirty** strands in total, which is too many. **Let us make two** colored threads of **nine** strands and **one of ten**; but the verse states: “**And you shall make**,” to indicate **that all the makings of it must be equal**. Perforce, the threads used for the pomegranates and the robe must be derived from an item woven from threads of a number of strands divisible by three, such as the curtain.

מעיל שנים עשר מנא לך? דכתיב: “ועשית את מעיל האפוד

The Gemara continues to explain the *baraita*: That the **robe** must be woven from threads spun from **twelve** strands,¹¹ **from where do we derive this? As it is written: “And you shall make the robe of the ephod**

HALAKHA

The robe from twelve strands – מעיל שנים עשר – The High Priest’s robe was made entirely of sky-blue thread and its threads were twelve-fold (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:3).

HALAKHA

The curtain was made of twenty-four strands – פרוכת עשרים וארבעה: The curtain was made of four threads: White, sky-blue, purple, and scarlet. Each of these was a six-fold thread, yielding a count of twenty-four strands all together (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 7:16).

Each thread of the breastplate and ephod was made of twenty-eight strands – חושן ואפוד עשרים ושמונה: The ephod and the breastplate were made of five types of threads. There were four six-fold colored threads: Sky-blue, purple, scarlet, and white, plus a gold thread, yielding a count of twenty-eight threads (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:5).

NOTES

There would be eight – הוּוּ לְהוּ תִּמְנַנָּא: The Gemara does not explain why a thread of eight may not be made. Perhaps Rav Ashi accepts Rav Aha bar Ya'akov's interpretation of "cords," which teaches there are at least four strands. As a rule, it is always assumed that the smallest quantity possible is indicated. Were one willing to accept the possibility that a multiple of four is included, there is no reason to make a distinction between eight, twelve, or even one hundred. Therefore, in this case, one should limit it to four strands (see *Tosafot* and *Maharsha*).

בְּלִיל תְּבִלְתָּ וְיִלִּיף תְּבִלְתָּ תְּבִלְתָּ מִפְּרוֹכְתָּ, מִה לְהֵלֵן שְׂשָׁה – אֵף כָּאֵן שְׂשָׁה.

וְנִילָף מִשׁוּלְיוֹ וְרִמּוֹנָיו, מִה לְהֵלֵן שְׂמוֹנֶה – אֵף כָּאֵן שְׂמוֹנֶה! דְּנִין כְּלֵי מִכְלֵי וְאֵין דְּנִין כְּלֵי מִתְּכַשִּׁיט כְּלֵי.

אֲדַרְבֵּהּ, דְּנִין גּוֹפּוֹ מִגּוֹפּוֹ, וְאֵין דְּנִין גּוֹפּוֹ מִעֲמֻלָּא! הֵינּוּ דְאִמְרוּנִי: לְשָׂאָר בְּגָדִים, שְׂלֵא נֶאֱמַר בְּהֵן שֵׁשׁ.

“פְּרוֹכְתָּ עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה” אֲרַבְּעָה דְשִׁיתָא שִׁיתָא – לָא דִּינָא וְלָא דִּינָא.

“חושן ואפוד עשרים ושמונה” מנא לן? דְּכִתִּיב: “וְעָשִׂיתָ חושן משפט מעשה חושב כמעשה אפוד תעשנו זהב תבלת וארגמן ותולעת שני ושש משור”, אֲרַבְּעָה דְשִׁיתָא שִׁיתָא – עֶשְׂרִין וְאַרְבָּעָה, וְהֵב אֲרַבְּעָה – הָא עֶשְׂרִין וְתִמְנַנָּא.

וְאִימָא וְהֵב נְמִי שְׂשָׁה! אָמַר רַב אֲחָא בְּרַי יַעֲקֹב, אָמַר קָרָא: “וְקָצַץ פְּתִילִים”, “פְּתִיל” “פְּתִילִים” הָרִי כָּאֵן אֲרַבְּעָה.

רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר, אָמַר קָרָא: “לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּתוֹךְ הַתְּבִלְתָּ וּבְתוֹךְ הָאֲרָגְמָן”. יִכִּי נַעֲבִיד? נַעֲבִיד אֲרַבְּעָה דְתַרִי תַרִי – הוּוּ לְהוּ תִּמְנַנָּא. נַעֲבִיד תַרִי דְתַרִי תַרִי, וְתַרִי דְתַרִי חַד – “וְעָשִׂיתָ” שְׂיֵהִיו כָּל עֲשִׂוִּיתָיו שְׂוֹת.

spun of sky-blue” (Exodus 28:31). And derive a verbal analogy from the term “sky-blue” used here and the same term “sky-blue” from the verse about the curtain: Just as there, with regard to the curtain, there are six strands, so too here, there are six strands. Then, since the Torah also says the threads are spun, i.e., each strand is made of two thinner strands spun together, each thread must contain twelve strands.

The Gemara suggests: Let us derive the number of strands in the robe from its hem and pomegranates: Just as there, each thread is spun from eight strands, so too here, the threads should be spun from eight strands. The Gemara rejects this: It is preferable to derive the *halakhah* of a utensil, i.e., the robe, from the *halakhah* of another utensil, i.e., the curtain, and one should not derive the *halakhah* of a utensil from the *halakhah* of something that is merely an ornament of a utensil, i.e., the pomegranates of the robe.

The Gemara asks: On the contrary, it is preferable to derive the *halakhah* of an object from that object itself, i.e., to assume that the *halakhah* of the robe and its pomegranates are similar; and one should not derive the *halakhah* of an object from elsewhere. The Gemara explains: This is precisely what we said in the *baraita*: One of the five mentions of *shesh* in the verse is to teach that the requirement that threads be made from six strands applies also to other garments about which *shesh* is not explicitly stated, such as the robe.

The *baraita* further states: Each thread of the curtain was made of twenty-four strands.^H The Gemara explains: With regard to each thread being composed of four colored threads: White, purple, scarlet, and sky-blue, and each one of them being composed of six strands, there is neither judgment nor judge, i.e., it is absolutely clear that this is how the threads of the curtain are produced.

The *baraita* further states: Each thread of the breastplate and ephod was made of twenty-eight strands.^H From where do we derive this? As it is written: “And you shall make a breastplate of judgment, the work of the skilled craftsman; like the work of the ephod you shall make it: Of gold, sky-blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen” (Exodus 28:15). There are four colored threads, each composed of six strands, which makes twenty-four. In addition, gold is spun together with each of the four colors, giving the total of twenty-eight.

But couldn't one say the gold should be made as a thread of six strands, like the other colors? Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said that the verse states: “And they beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into cords, to work it into the sky-blue, and into the purple, and into the scarlet, and into the fine linen, the work of a skilled craftsman” (Exodus 39:3). “Cord” implies a strand that is doubled over and can be twisted into a cord; “cords” is in the plural, meaning at least two of these. Accordingly, there are four strands here.

Rav Ashi said: This can be seen from that fact that the verse states with regard to the gold strands: “To work it into the sky-blue, and into the purple” (Exodus 39:3), indicating that the gold strands should be combined with the other colors. What should we do? If we make four gold threads of two strands each and combine each one with each of the colors, then there would be eight.^N If we make two gold threads of two strands each, and two gold threads of one strand each, it says: “And you shall make,” indicating that all its makings should be the same. Therefore, one strand of gold should be combined with each of the colors, producing a total of twenty-eight strands.

אָמַר רַחֲבָא אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: הַמְקַרַע בְּגָדֵי כְהוֹנֵה – לֹא יִקְרַע. שְׁנַאֲמַר: “לֹא יִקְרַע.” מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אֲחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב: וְדִלְמָא הֲכִי קָאָמַר רַחֲמָנָא: נַעֲבִיד לֵיהּ שְׂפָה כִּי הֵיכִי דְלָא נִיקְרַע! מִי כְּתִיב “שְׁלֹא יִקְרַע?”

§ The Gemara discusses various *halakhot* concerning the priestly vestments and other sacred vessels: **Rahava said that Rav Yehuda said: One who intentionally tears any of the priestly vestments^{MH} transgresses a prohibition and is flogged, as it is stated concerning the robe: “It shall have a hem of woven work around the opening of it, like the opening of a coat of mail, and it shall not be torn” (Exodus 28:32).** Just as it is prohibited to tear the opening of the robe, so too, it is prohibited to tear any of the priestly vestments. **Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov strongly objects to this: But perhaps this is what the Merciful One is saying in the Torah: An opening should be made in order that it not tear.** In other words, the Torah was giving an explanation, not a prohibition. The Gemara rejects this: **Is it written: In order that it not be torn?**^N Clearly, the intention of the verse is to state a prohibition.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֱלֵעָזָר: הַמּוֹיֵחַ חוּשׁוֹן מֵעַל הָאֶפֶוד, וְהַמְסִיר בְּדֵי אָרוֹן – לֹא יִקְרַע. שְׁנַאֲמַר: “לֹא יִזַּח” וְ“לֹא יִסּוּרוּ.” מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אֲחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב: וְדִלְמָא כִּי קָאָמַר רַחֲמָנָא – תְּדַקְיָנְהוּ וְעַבְדֵינְהוּ שְׁפִיר בְּדֵי שְׁלֹא יִזַּח וְלֹא יִסּוּרוּ! מִי כְּתִיב “שְׁלֹא יִזַּח” וְ“שְׁלֹא יִסּוּרוּ”?

Rabbi Elazar said: **One who detaches the breastplate from upon the ephod^H or one who removes the staves of the Ark^H from their rings transgresses a Torah prohibition and is flogged, as it is stated: “And the breastplate shall not be detached from the ephod”TM (Exodus 28:28), and it is also stated: “The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15).**^N **Rav Aḥa bar Ya’akov strongly objects to this: But perhaps when the Merciful One said this in the Torah, the intention was to strengthen them and make them fast so that the breastplate not become detached from the ephod and the staves not be removed.** He suggests that the Torah was giving an explanation, not a prohibition. The Gemara rejects this: **Is it written: In order that it not become detached, and: In order that they not be removed?** Clearly, the intention of the verse is to state a prohibition.

רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְרַבִּי חֲנִינָא רְמִי כְּתִיב: “בְּטַבְּעוֹת הָאָרוֹן יִהְיוּ הַבְּדִים לֹא יִסּוּרוּ מִמֶּנּוּ,” וְכְתִיב: “וְהוֹבֵא אֶת בְּדֵי בְטַבְּעוֹת.” הֲאֵלֶּכֶּיז? מִתְפָּרְקִין וְאִין נִשְׁמָטִין.

Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, raised a contradiction. In one verse it is written: **“The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15),** implying the staves should remain there permanently. But in another verse it is written: **“And its staves shall be put into the rings” (Exodus 27:7),** implying that when the Ark is used the staves are inserted, which suggests that they do not remain there permanently. **How is this contradiction resolved? The staves could be removed from their position, i.e., they were loosened, but did not come out.**^N The staves were wider at their ends and thinner in the middle. Therefore, once they had been forced into the rings, although they could be shifted, they would not be removed entirely.

תַּנְיָא נִמְי הֲכִי: “בְּטַבְּעוֹת הָאָרוֹן יִהְיוּ הַבְּדִים.” יָכוֹל לֹא יִהְיוּ זָזִין מִמְּקוֹמָן – תַּלְמוּד לֹאֲמַר “וְהוֹבֵא אֶת בְּדֵי בְטַבְּעוֹת,” אִי “וְהוֹבֵא אֶת בְּדֵי” יָכוֹל יִהְיוּ נִכְנָסִין וְיוֹצְאִין – תַּלְמוּד לֹאֲמַר: “בְּטַבְּעוֹת הָאָרוֹן יִהְיוּ הַבְּדִים,” הֲאֵלֶּכֶּיז? מִתְפָּרְקִין וְאִין נִשְׁמָטִין.

That was also taught in a *baraita*. The verse states: **“The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15).** One might have thought that they should not move from their place at all; therefore, the verse states: **“And its staves shall be put into the rings” (Exodus 27:7).** If it had stated: **And its staves shall be put,** one might have thought that they are inserted and removed entirely; therefore, the verse states: **“The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it” (Exodus 25:15).** **How is this? They could be removed from their position, but did not come out.**

NOTES

One who tears priestly vestments – **הַמְקַרַע בְּגָדֵי כְהוֹנֵה:** In order for people to treat the priestly vestments with due care and honor, the Torah prohibited tearing them (*Sefer HaHinukh*). According to some halakhic authorities, there is a distinction between the robe and the other garments. One who tears the opening of the robe violates the prohibition even if he tears for constructive purposes, whereas one is liable for tearing the other garments only if he does so in a destructive manner (see *Yad David*, *Mishne LaMelekh*, and *Minḥat Hinukh*).

Is it written: In order that it not be torn – “שְׁלֹא יִקְרַע”: The author of the *Korban Hagiga* notes that normally the Gemara does not explain explanatory clauses in the Torah as a distinct commandment. For example, the phrase: “And his heart shall not be led astray” (Deuteronomy 17:17) is understood as an

explanation for the *halakhot* restricting a king from marrying numerous wives. Why, then, is this case different? Some commentaries suggest that since the details of the Temple vessels and priestly vestments appear twice in the Torah, once when commanding how to construct them and once when describing their actual construction, and the explanatory clauses appear both times, it is therefore unlikely that these clauses come only to explain and not to add a new *halakha* (*Be'er Avraham*).

Prohibition of detaching the breastplate – אִיסוּר הַחֲתַח חוּשׁוֹן: Part of the glory and beauty of the Temple was that each item had its specific place within the Temple. This was also true of the priestly vestments. The prohibition to detach the breastplate is an expression of this idea (*Sefer HaHinukh*).

Prohibition of removing the staves – אִיסוּר הַסֵּרֵת הַבְּדִים: Some

One who tears priestly vestments – **הַמְקַרַע בְּגָדֵי כְהוֹנֵה:** One who tears the opening of either the priestly robe or any other priestly garment in a destructive way is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:3).

One who detaches the breastplate from upon the ephod – **הַמּוֹיֵחַ חוּשׁוֹן מֵעַל הָאֶפֶוד:** One who detaches the breastplate from the ephod in a destructive way is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:10).

One who removes the staves of the Ark – **הַמְסִיר בְּדֵי אָרוֹן:** One who removes a staff from the rings of the Ark is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:10).

suggest that the reason the staves had to remain in position was for times when it was necessary to transport the Ark quickly to a different location. Were the staves not permanently in place, in the rush to move the Ark, the staves might not be inserted properly and the Ark might fall. Another explanation claims that the staves were not merely functional but part of structure of the Ark itself. As such, they had to always remain as part of the Ark (*Sefer HaHinukh*).

מִתְפָּרְקִין וְאִין – נִשְׁמָטִין: According to Rashi, the staves were made in such a way that they could be removed only with great effort. *Tosafot* maintain that the staves’ design allowed them to be removed with ease; nevertheless, the Levites were cautioned to move them only to transport the Ark, but never to remove them.

BACKGROUND

Acacia wood – עצי שטים: According to some scholars, the type of acacia wood mentioned here is from the *Faidherbia albida*, also known as the Ana tree. It can reach a height of 30 m and straight boards can be created from it.



Ana tree

NOTES

They supported their plating – שְׁמַעְמִידִים אֶת צְפוּיִן: This meant that nails were not needed to hold the gold plating to the boards (Rabbi Elyakim; see Rashi and Tosafot).

Perek VII Daf 72 Amud b

NOTES

Priestly vestments – בגדי כהונה: The Ramban explains that the *serad* garments are the priestly vestments, as it would appear from the Gemara here. Indeed, in the Jerusalem Talmud there is a lengthy discussion about the atonement properties of the priestly garments, explaining which sin is atoned for by which garment. Rashi, however, explains that the *serad* garments were not priestly vestments at all; rather, they were the coverings for the Temple utensils.

HALAKHA

A sleeve made for the priestly vestments – בית יד של בגדי: The tunic of the priestly vestments, both for a common priest and a High Priest, is woven separately from the sleeves. The latter are later sewn to the body of the tunic (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Kelei HaMikdash* 8:16).

Length of the sleeve – אורך בית היד: The sleeve of the priestly tunic reached as far as the palm of the hand (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Kelei HaMikdash* 8:17).

אָמַר רַבִּי חָמָא בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: מַאי דְּכַתִּיב: "עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים עוֹמְדִים", שְׁעוֹמְדִים דְּרַךְ גְּדִילְתָּן. דְּבַר אַחֵר: "עוֹמְדִים" – שְׁמַעְמִידִין אֶת צְפוּיִן. דְּבַר אַחֵר: "עוֹמְדִים", שְׁמָא תֵּאמְרוּ אֶבְדַּד סַבְרִין וּבִטְלִין סְבוּיִין – תִּלְמוּד לִזְמַר: "עוֹמְדִים" – שְׁעוֹמְדִין לְעוֹלָם וּלְעוֹלָמִים.

אָמַר רַבִּי חָמָא בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא, מַאי דְּכַתִּיב: "אֶת בְּגָדֵי הַשְּׂרָד לְשֵׂרֵת בְּקוֹדֶשׁ".

The Gemara cites other statements concerning the ark. Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "And you shall make the boards for the Tabernacle of acacia wood,⁸ standing" (Exodus 26:15)? This verse teaches that the boards of wood used for the Tabernacle should stand in the same direction in which they grew from the ground as a tree. Alternatively, "standing" means that they supported their gold plating⁹ and prevented it from falling. Alternatively, "standing" is written to hint at the following: Perhaps you will say that now that the Tabernacle is no longer in use, their hope is lost and their chance is abandoned, and after being stored away the boards will no longer return to use. Therefore, the verse states "standing" to indicate that they stand forever and ever.

S The Gemara returns to its discussion of the priestly vestments: Rabbi Ḥama bar Ḥanina said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "The plaited [*serad*] garments, for serving in the Sanctuary" (Exodus 35:19)? Why does the verse refer to the priestly vestments as "*serad* garments"?

אֲלֵמִילָא בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנָה לֹא נִשְׁתַּיֵּיר מִשְׁוֹנְאֵיהוֹן שׁוֹל יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׂרִיד וּפְלִיט.

He offers a homiletic interpretation: Were it not for the priestly vestments,¹⁰ which provide atonement for the Jewish people, there would not remain a remnant [*sarid*] or survivor from the haters of the Jewish people, a euphemism used to refer to the Jewish people themselves. Due to the atonement provided by the priestly vestments, a remnant [*sarid*] of the Jewish people does survive.

רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר, דְּבִי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן תֵּנָא: בְּגָדִים שְׁגוּרְדִין אוֹתָן כְּבָרִייתָן מְבַלְיָהוּ, וּמְשַׁרְדִין מְהֵן כְּלוּם, מַאי הֵיא? רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: אֵלּוּ מַעֲשֵׂה מַחֵט.

Another interpretation: Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that the school of Rabbi Shimon taught: The priestly vestments are referred to as "*serad* garments" because they are garments that are woven in their completed form upon the loom, as opposed to weaving the material and then cutting and sewing pieces of the material together to create the required form, and then just a small part of them remains [*masridin*] which is not completed upon the loom. What is the remnant, the part that was not woven? Reish Lakish said: This is the needle-work required to complete the garment.

מִיתִיבִי: בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנָה אֵין עוֹשִׂין אוֹתָן מַעֲשֵׂה מַחֵט אֲלָא מַעֲשֵׂה אוּרְגָא, שְׁנַאמַר: "מַעֲשֵׂה אוּרְגָא" – אָמַר אַבְיִי: לֹא נַצְרְכָה אֲלָא לְבֵית יַד שְׁלֵהֶם. כְּדַתְנִיא: בֵּית יַד שְׁלֵהֶם בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנָה נִצְרְגָת בְּפִנֵי עֲצָמָה וְנִדְבְּקָת עִם הַבְּגָד, וּמִנְעַת עַד פִּיסַת הַיָּד.

The Gemara raises an objection to this from a *baraita*: Priestly vestments should not be made through needle-work but through woven work, as it is stated: "Woven work" (Exodus 28:32). The Gemara answers that Abaye said: Reish Lakish's statement is necessary only for, i.e., refers only to, the sleeves. As it was taught in a *baraita*: A sleeve made for the priestly vestments¹¹ is woven separately and then attached to the garment by sewing, and the sleeve is made to reach as far as the palm of the hand.¹¹ However, the main body of the garment must indeed be made exclusively through weaving.

שָׁמָּה תִּשְׂמְרֵהוּ פְּחוּתֵי הָיָה – Perhaps you will say it is inferior – This superiority of the crown of Torah is alluded to by the subtle difference in the descriptions of the crowns of the different vessels. For the other sacred vessels, the Torah simply states: “You shall make a crown” (Exodus 25:25 and 30:3), whereas for the Ark the Torah specifies: “You shall make a crown upon it” (Exodus 25:11). This suggests that the crown of the Ark, which symbolizes Torah, was raised above the rest (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

אָמַר רַבְּהִי אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: שְׁלֹשׁ אֲרוֹנוֹת עָשָׂה בְּצִלְאֵל, אֶמְצָעִי שֶׁל עֵץ תִּשְׁעָה, פְּנִימִי שֶׁל זָהָב שְׂמוֹנֶה, חִיצוֹן עֲשָׂרָה וּמִשְׁהוּ.

§ The Gemara cites statements concerning other Temple vessels: **Rahava said that Rav Yehuda said:** The Torah states that the Ark should be made of wood with gold plating inside and out (Exodus 25:10–11). In order to achieve this **Bezalel made three arks: A middle one made of wood**, whose height was **nine** handbreadths; **an inner one made of gold**, whose height was **eight** handbreadths; and an **outer one of gold**, whose height was **ten** handbreadths **and a bit**. These arks were nested.

וְהִתְנִיחָא: אֶחָד עֲשָׂר וּמִשְׁהוּ! לָא קָשִׁיָּא: הָא – כִּמְמָן דְּאָמַר יֵשׁ בְּעֵבְרֵי טַפַּח, הָא כִּמְמָן דְּאָמַר אֵין בְּעֵבְרֵי טַפַּח. וּמֵאֵי מִשְׁהוּ – זִיר.

The Gemara asks: **But wasn't it taught** in a *baraita* that the outer ark was **eleven** handbreadths **and a bit**? The Gemara explains: **This is not difficult:** This statement in the *baraita* is in accordance with the one who said that the thickness of the gold plating was **one handbreadth**. According to this opinion, the outer ark's base took up one handbreadth of its height, ten handbreadths were then needed to contain the middle ark within it, and then a bit more was needed so it could also contain the Ark's cover. **That statement of Rav Yehuda is in accordance with the one who said that the thickness of the gold plating was not one handbreadth** but was a plate of gold of negligible thickness. According to this opinion, the outer ark needed to be only ten handbreadths and a bit and could still contain the outer ark and have room for the cover. **And what is this additional bit?** It is the ornamental **crown** on the edge of the outer ark.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: שְׁלֹשָׁה זִירִים הָיוּ: שֶׁל מִזְבֵּחַ וְשֶׁל אֲרוֹן וְשֶׁל שֻׁלְחָן. שֶׁל מִזְבֵּחַ – זָכָה אֶהְרֹן וְנִטְלוּ, שֶׁל שֻׁלְחָן – זָכָה דָּוִד וְנִטְלוּ, שֶׁל אֲרוֹן – עֲדֵינִן מוֹנֵחַ הוּא. כָּל הָרוֹצֵה לִיקַח – יְבֵא יוֹקֵחַ, שָׁמָּה תִּשְׂמְרֵהוּ פְּחוּתֵי הָיָה. תִּלְמִיד לֹא יוֹמַר: “בִּי מְלָכִים יִמְלֹכוּ.”

Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There were **three crowns** on the sacred vessels in the Temple: The crown of the altar, and of the Ark, and of the table. The regal appearance they provided symbolized power and authority: The crown of the altar symbolized the crown of priesthood; **Aaron was deserving and took it**, and the priesthood continues exclusively through his descendants. The crown of the table symbolized the abundance and blessing associated with the crown of kingship; **David was deserving and took it** for himself and his descendants after him. The crown of the Ark symbolized the crown of Torah; **it is still sitting** and waiting to be acquired, **and anyone who wishes to take it may come and take it** and be crowned with the crown of Torah. **Perhaps you will say it is inferiorⁿ** to the other two crowns and that is why nobody has taken it; therefore, **the verse states** about the wisdom of Torah: “**Through me kings will reign**” (Proverbs 8:15), indicating that the strength of the other crowns is derived from the crown of Torah, which is greater than them all.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן רָמִי: כְּתִיב “זֶר” וְקָרִינָה “זִיר”, זָכָה – נַעֲשִׂיתָ לוֹ זִיר, לֹא זָכָה – זֶרָה הֵימְנוּ.

§ The Gemara presents a number of statements based on the idea that the Ark symbolizes the Torah: **Rabbi Yoḥanan raised a contradiction:** According to the way the word crown is written in the Torah (Exodus 25:11), without vowels, it should be pronounced *zar*, meaning strange, **but** according to the traditional vocalization we read it as *zeir*, meaning crown. These two ways of understanding the word appear to contradict each other. Rabbi Yoḥanan explains: The two understandings apply to two different situations: If one is **deserving** by performing mitzvot, **it becomes a crown [zeir] for him**; but if one is **not deserving**, the Torah will **be a stranger [zara] to him** and he will forget his studies.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן רָמִי: כְּתִיב “וַעֲשִׂיתָ לְךָ אֲרוֹן עֵץ” וְכִתִּיב “וַעֲשׂוּ אֲרוֹן עֵצֵי שִׁטִּים” – מִכָּאן לְתַלְמִיד חָכֵם שְׂבִינֵי עִירוֹ מְצוּיִין לַעֲשׂוֹת לוֹ מְלָאכְתּוֹ.

Rabbi Yoḥanan raised a contradiction: It is written: “**And you shall make for yourself a wooden Ark**” (Deuteronomy 10:1), implying that Moses alone was commanded to construct the Ark; **and it is written:** “**And they shall make an Ark of acacia wood**” (Exodus 25:10), implying that the Jewish people were all commanded to be involved in its construction. The apparent resolution to this contradiction is that although only Moses actually constructed the Ark, everyone was required to support the endeavor. So too, **from here it is derived with regard to a Torah scholar that the members of his town should perform his work for him** to support him and allow him to focus on his studies, since it is also the town's responsibility to enable him to study.

Drinks iniquity like water – שוֹתֵה כְּמֵי עוֹלָה: The metaphor of drinking water illustrates well the image of a Torah scholar who learns Torah without his studies being discernible in his actions. In the same way, when a person has drunk water, there is still no change in his external appearance (Rabbi Elyakim).

Gehenna twice – תְּרֵי גֵיהֶנֶם: Others explain that a Torah scholar who does not fulfill the commandments is punished more severely than others. Additionally, he is punished for the Torah he learned without the associated fear of Heaven; it would have been better had he not studied, as indicated by the verse: "God says to the wicked: Who are you to recite My laws?" (Psalms 50:16). Therefore, in the World-to-Come he receives punishment in Gehenna that is twice as severe (Rav Ya'akov Emden).

To testify about those who study it – לְהַעֲדֵי בְּלוּמְדֵיהָ: Some explain this as a reference to the ultimate day of judgment, when the Torah itself will act as a witness to testify on behalf of those who were faithful to it. Others suggest that this means that the Torah will publicize the righteousness of those who were faithful to it (Ritva).

"מִבֵּית וּמִחוּץ תִּצְפְּנוּ" אָמַר רַבָּא: כָּל תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם שֶׁאֵין תּוֹכוֹ בְּבָרוּ – אֵינוֹ תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם.

אָמַר אַבְי וְאִיתִּמָּא רַבָּה בַר עוּלָא: נִקְרָא נִתְעָב, שְׁנֵאָמַר: "אִף כִּי נִתְעָב וְנִאֲלַח אִישׁ שׁוֹתֵה כְּמֵי עוֹלָה".

אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן, מָאי דְכִתְבִּיב: "לָמָּה זֶה מְחִיר בִּיד כְּסִיל לְקִנּוּת חֲכָמָה וְלֵב אֵין" – אוּי לָהֶם לְשׁוֹנְאֵיהֶן שֶׁל תַּלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים שֶׁעוֹסְקִין בַּתּוֹרָה, וְאֵין בְּהֶן יְרֵאת שְׁמַיִם.

מְכַרְיוֹ רַבִּי יַנָּאי: חָבַל עַל דְּלִית לֵיהּ דִּרְתָא, וְתִרְעָא לְדִרְתֵיהּ עֲבִיד.

אָמַר לָהּ רַבָּא לְרַבְנָן: בְּמַטְוֵא מִיַּיְכוּ, לֹא תִירְתוּן תְּרֵי גֵיהֶנֶם.

אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֹוי, מָאי דְכִתְבִּיב: "וְזֹאת הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר שָׂם מֹשֶׁה" זָכָה – נְעִשִׂית לֹו סַם חַיִּים, לֹא זָכָה – נְעִשִׂית לֹו סַם מִיתָה. וְהֵינּוּ דְאָמַר רַבָּא: דְּאֹמְנֵן לָהּ – סָמָא דְחַיָּיא, דְּלֹא אֹמְנֵן לָהּ – סָמָא דְמוֹתָא.

אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי, רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן רָמִי: כְּתִיב "פְּקוּדֵי ה' יִשְׂרָאֵל מִשְׁמַחֵי לֵב" וְכִתְבִּיב "אִמְרַת ה' צְרוּפָה" זָכָה – מִשְׁמַחְתּוֹ, לֹא זָכָה – צוּרְפָתוֹ. רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: מְגוּפִיָּה דְקִרָא נִפְקָא, זָכָה – צוּרְפָתוֹ לְחַיִּים, לֹא זָכָה – צוּרְפָתוֹ לְמִיתָה.

"יְרֵאת ה' טְהוֹרָה עוֹמֶדֶת לְעַד" אָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: זֶה הַלּוּמֵד תּוֹרָה בְּטָהָרָה. מָאי הִיא – נוֹשֵׂא אִשָּׁה וְאַחַר כֵּךְ לּוּמֵד תּוֹרָה.

"עֵדוּת ה' נֶאֱמָנָה" אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בַר אֲבָא: נֶאֱמָנָה הִיא לְהַעֲדֵי בְּלוּמְדֵיהָ.

The verse states concerning the Ark: "From within and from without you shall cover it" (Exodus 25:11). Rava said: This alludes to the idea that any Torah scholar whose inside is not like his outside, i.e., whose outward expression of righteousness is insincere, is not to be considered a Torah scholar.

Abaye said, and some say it was Rabba bar Ulla who said: Not only is such a person not to be considered a Torah scholar, but he is called loathsome, as it is stated: "What then of one loathsome and foul, man who drinks iniquity like water" (Job 15:16).¹⁴ Although he drinks the Torah like water, since he sins, his Torah is considered iniquitous and this makes him loathsome and foul.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "Why is there a price in the hand of a fool to buy wisdom, as he has no heart?" (Proverbs 17:16)? This expresses the following sentiment: Woe to them, haters of Torah scholars, a euphemism for the Torah scholars themselves, who immerse themselves in Torah and have no fear of Heaven. They are fools; they try to acquire the wisdom of Torah, but since they have no fear of Heaven in their hearts they lack the ability to do so.

Rabbi Yannai declared that the situation may be expressed by the following sentiment: Pity him who has no courtyard but senselessly makes a gate for his courtyard. Fear of Heaven is like the courtyard, and the study of Torah is the gate that provides entrance to the courtyard. The study of Torah is purposeful only if it leads to fear of Heaven.

Rava said to the Sages in the study hall: I beg of you, do not inherit Gehenna twice.¹⁵ By studying Torah without the accompanying fear of Heaven, not only are you undeserving of the World-to-Come, but even in this world you experience Gehenna, as you spend all your time in study and fail to benefit from worldly pleasure.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "And this is the Torah which Moses put [sam] before the children of Israel" (Deuteronomy 4:44)? The word sam is written with the letter sin and means put; it is phonetically similar to the word sam written with the letter samekh, meaning a drug. This use of this word therefore alludes to the following: If one is deserving, the Torah becomes a potion [sam] of life for him. If one is not deserving, the Torah becomes a potion of death for him. And this idea is what Rava said: For one who is skillful in his study of Torah and immerses himself in it with love, it is a potion of life; but for one who is not skillful in his studies, it is a potion of death.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan raised a contradiction: It was written: "The precepts of the Lord are upright, gladdening the heart" (Psalms 19:9), but it is also written: "The word of the Lord is refining" (Psalms 18:31), which implies that the study of Torah can be a distressing process by which a person is refined like metal smelted in a smith's fire. He reconciles these verses as follows: For one who is deserving, the Torah gladdens him; for one who is not deserving, it refines him. Reish Lakish said: This lesson emerges from that second verse itself: For one who is deserving, the Torah refines him for life; for one who is not deserving, it refines him for death.

The verse states: "Fear of the Lord is pure, it stands forever" (Psalms 19:10). Rabbi Hanina said: This is referring to one who studies Torah in purity; for such a person the Torah will remain with him forever. What is this; what does it mean to study in purity? One first marries a woman and afterward studies Torah. Since he is married, his heart will not be occupied with thoughts of sin, which could lead him to become impure.

In the same Psalm the verse states: "The testimony of God is faithful" (Psalms 19:8). Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said: This alludes to the fact that the Torah is faithful to testify about those who study it¹⁶ and those who do not.

“מעשה רוקם” “מעשה חושב” אמר רבי אלעזר: שרוקמין במקום שחושבין.

The Gemara returns to its discussion concerning the sacred vessels: The verse states with regard to the covers for the Tabernacle that they are “**work of an embroiderer**” (Exodus 26:36), and it also states they are “**work of a designer**” (Exodus 26:31). How can both descriptions be reconciled? **Rabbi Elazar said: They embroidered the place where they had designed.** They first marked a design on the material in paint, and then they embroidered it.

תנא משמיה דרבי נחמיה: רוקם – מעשה מחט, לפיכך פרצוף אחד. חושב – מעשה אורג, לפיכך שני פרצופות.

A Sage taught in the name of Rabbi Nehemya: “Work of an **embroiderer**” refers to **needlework**, which therefore produces only **one face**. The design is made with a needle passing back and forth from both sides of the curtain, and consequently an identical parallel image, or one face, is formed on both sides. “Work of a **designer**” refers to **woven work**, which therefore produces **two faces**. Although formed together, the two sides of the material were not identical; for example, sometimes an eagle appeared on one side while a lion was on the other side.^h

“באלו נשאלין באורים ותומים.” בי אתא רב דימי אמר: בגדים שבהן גדול משמש בהן משוח מלחמה משמש בהן, שנאמר: “ובגדי הקודש אשר לאהרן יהיו לבניו אחריו” – למי שבא בגדולה אחריו.

It was taught in the mishna: When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim*. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: The garments in which the High Priest serves are also worn when the **priest anointed for war serves**. This priest is appointed to recite words of encouragement to the nation before it goes out to war (see Deuteronomy 20:2). **As it is stated: “And the sacred garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him”** (Exodus 29:29), which is taken to refer to the **one who comes after him in greatness**, meaning the priest whose rank is one lower than the High Priest, i.e., the priest anointed for war.

מתבי רב אדא בר אבהו, ואמרי לה כדי: יכול יהא בנו של משוח מלחמה משמש תחתיו, כדרך שבנו של בהן גדול משמש תחתיו.

Rav Adda bar Ahava raised an objection, and some say it unattributed: It is taught in a *baraita*: One might have thought that the son of the priest anointed for war serves in his place, i.e., he inherits the position, in the same way that the son of a High Priest serves in his place if he is fit for the job;^h

Perek VII
Daf 73 Amud a

תלמוד לומר: “שבעת ימים ילבשם הבהן תחתיו מבניו אשר יבא אל אהל מועד” – מי שראוי לבא אל אהל מועד. ואם איתא, מיחזא חזי!

therefore, the verse states: “Seven days shall he wear them, the one who serves in his stead from among his sons, who comes into the Tent of Meeting to serve in the Sanctuary” (Exodus 29:30). The verse describes a son serving in the place of his father, indicating that the position is inherited. The conclusion of the verse implies that the rule that a son inherits his father’s position applies only to a High Priest who is fit to enter the **Tent of Meeting**, but not to the priest anointed for war. Based on this *baraita*, the following challenge is posed: **And if it is so**, since the priest anointed for war also serves wearing the same garments as the High Priest, **he is also fit to enter the Tent of Meeting** and should bequeath his position to his son.

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק, הכי קאמר: כל שעיקר משיחתו לאהל מועד, יצא זה שעיקר משיחתו למלחמה.

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that this is what the *baraita* is saying: The rule that a son inherits his father’s position applies to anyone for whom the primary purpose of his anointment is to come and serve in the **Tent of Meeting**. That excludes this priest for whom the primary purpose of his anointment is for war.

מיתבי: משוח מלחמה אינו משמש לא בארבעה כהן הדיוט, לא בשמונה כהן גדול!

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Dimi’s claim: It was taught in a *baraita* that the priest anointed for war serves neither in four garments, like a common priest, nor in eight garments, like a High Priest.

מעשה – מעשה רוקם ומעשה חושב: Whenever the Torah uses the phrase: “Work of a designer,” it indicates that the images are woven and are visible on only one side of the fabric. The phrase: “Work of an embroiderer” means that the images should look the same from either side of the fabric. This is in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Nehemya (see *Kesef Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:15).

ורשת – משוח מלחמה: A priest anointed for war does not bequeath his position to his son. The son, however, may be appointed to the position on his own merits (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 4:21).

Due to the principle: One elevates in sanctity and one does not downgrade – משום מעלין בקדש ולא מורידין – *Tosafot Yeshanim* note that if the priest anointed for war remains in his position, then the reason he may not serve in four garments is that since by Torah law he should be serving in eight garments, it is prohibited for him to serve in fewer. Why does the Gemara suggest a different reason? They explain that the Gemara refers to a case where the priest was forced to step down from his position, e.g., because he became sick or elderly and could no longer go out to the battlefields and consequently another priest was appointed in his place. Since he no longer serves, there is no longer any prohibition for him to wear fewer than eight garments. However, because he retains the personal sanctity of a priest anointed for war, to now only wear four garments would be an infraction of the principle that one should not downgrade in matters of sanctity.

The bull brought for all the mitzvot – פר הבא על כל המצות – According to Rashi and other commentators, the bull brought for all the mitzvot is the same as the bull of an anointed priest. The bull sacrificed as a sin-offering for the congregation is not mentioned here because essentially it is an offering of the community, not of the High Priest. As such, in the event that there was no High Priest, a common priest would sacrifice it (see *Tosafot Yeshanim* and Ritva).

אמר ליה אבוי: אלא יך משוית ליה?
אלא ככהן גדול – משום איבה,
ככהן הדיוט – משום מעלין בקדש
ולא מורידין.

אמר ליה רב אדא בר אבא לרבא:
והאי תנא דלית ליה איבה, ולא קא
משמש,

דתנא: דברים שבין כהן גדול לכהן
הדיוט: פר כהן משוית, ופר הבא על כל
המצות, ופר יום הכפורים, ועשירות
האיפה.

לא פורע ולא פורם, אבל פורם הוא
מלמשה, וההדיוט מלמעלה, ואין
משמא לקרוביו, ומצוה על הבתולה,
ומוזהר על האלמנה, ומחזיר את
הרוצח.

ומקריב אוגן ואינו אוכל, ואינו
חולק, ונוטל חלק בראש, ומקריב
חלק בראש, ומשמש בשמנה בלים,
ופטור על טומאת מקדש וקדשיו, וכל
עבודות יום הכפורים אינן כשירות
אלא בו.

וכולן נוהגות במרובה בגדים, חוץ
מפר הבא על כל המצות.

Abaye said to him: Would you make him like a non-priest? If he dresses like neither a High Priest nor a common priest, then effectively he is like a non-priest, but that is certainly not true. Rather, the meaning of the *baraita* is that the priest anointed for war does not dress like a High Priest due to the animosity that could be caused between him and the High Priest if they both wore similar garments. Therefore, although according to Torah law the priest anointed for war should dress like a High Priest, the Sages decreed that he should not, out of concern that animosity might result. And he does not dress like a common priest, due to the principle: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade.ⁿ Since the priest anointed for war attained the level of sanctity of a High Priest, he may not now be demoted to serve as an ordinary priest and dress accordingly.

Rav Adda bar Abba said to Rava: But there is this *tanna* of the following *baraita* who does not accept the concern of animosity as a reason to prevent one from wearing similar garments, and yet even according to him the priest anointed for war does not serve wearing the eight garments. Clearly, there must be a different reason.

As it was taught in a *baraita*: The matters in which there are differences between a High Priest and a common priest are as follows:

The bull of the anointed priest, also called the bull brought for all the mitzvot,ⁿ which is brought for unwittingly deciding and following an erroneous halakhic ruling in a case for which one would be liable to receive the penalty of *karet* had he committed it intentionally;

And the bull of Yom Kippur;

And the tenth of an ephah that the High Priest offers each day.

Only the High Priest brings the above offerings.

In addition, when in mourning, a High Priest does not let his hair grow wild, nor does he rend his clothing in the way other mourners do. But he does rend his clothing from below, in a place that is not noticeable, while the common priest rends from above in the normal manner.

And he may not become ritually impure in the event of the death of his close relatives, but a common priest may.

And he is commanded to marry a virgin, and he is prohibited from marrying a widow, in contrast to a common priest who is prohibited to marry only a divorcee.

And his death allows the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge.

And he sacrifices offerings even when he is an acute mourner, i.e., on the first day of his mourning, but he may not eat from the offerings on that day and he may not take a portion from them.

And he takes his portion first from any offering of his choice.

And he has the first right to sacrifice any offering he wants.

And he serves wearing eight garments.

And he is exempt from bringing an offering for unwittingly causing ritual impurity to the Temple and its sacred objects.

And all parts of the Yom Kippur service are valid only when performed by him.

And all these *halakhot* unique to the High Priest are not limited to one who was consecrated with anointing oil, but apply also to a High Priest of many garments. During the Second Temple period, when the oil used for anointing was no longer available for anointing High Priests, the High Priests were consecrated by virtue of wearing the eight garments. This is true except with regard to the bull brought for all the mitzvot, which is brought only by a High Priest consecrated with anointing oil.

וכולן נוהגות במשוח שְׁעֵבֶר חוץ מפר יום הכפורים ועשירית האיפה.

And all these *halakhot* apply to a former High Priest who had been consecrated to substitute for a High Priest who had become disqualified. If the disqualification of the original High Priest is removed, he may return to his position. Although the substitute no longer serves as a High Priest, he retains the sanctity of a High Priest and the *halakhot* of the High Priest continue to apply to him. This is true **except** with regard to the sacrifice of the bull on Yom Kippur and the sacrifice of the tenth of an ephah each day.

וכולן אין נוהגות במשוח מלחמה, חוץ מחמשה דברים האמורין בפרשה: לא פורע, ולא פורם, ולא מטמא לקרוביו, ומצווה על הבתולה, ומוזהר על האלמנה, ומחזיר את הרוצח בדברי רבי יהודה, וחכמים אומרים: אינו מחזיר.

And none of them applies to the priest anointed for war, except for the five items stated explicitly in the passage about the High Priest (Leviticus 21:10–15):

When in mourning, he **does not let his hair grow wild nor does he rend his clothing** in the way regular mourners do.

And he may **not become ritually impure** in the event of the death of his close relatives.

And he is **commanded to marry a virgin, and he is prohibited from marrying a widow.**

And his death allows the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehuda in tractate *Makkot* (11a). And the Rabbis say: His death **does not allow the return** of the accidental killer from the city of refuge.

כי לית ליה איבה – בדכותיה, בדיוטר מינה – אית ליה.

The *baraita* teaches that a former High Priest also wears the eight garments of the High Priest. It is therefore apparent that the *tanna* of the *baraita* is not concerned about animosity which could be caused if the High Priest and the former High Priest wear similar garments. Despite this, the *baraita* agrees that the priest anointed for war does not wear the eight garments. This suggests that the reason for this is not out of concern that animosity might result. The Gemara rejects this proof: **When the High Priest has no animosity** toward someone else wearing the same garments, it is only **where that person is similar to him**, such as a former High Priest who held the same rank. But toward someone **inferior to him** who wears the same garments, such as the priest anointed for war, **he does feel animosity.**^N

תיב רבי אבהו וקאמר לה להא שומעתא משומיה דרבי יוחנן. אהדרניהו רבי אמי ורבי אסי לאפניהו. איבא דאמרי רבי חייא בר אבא אמרה ואהדרניהו רבי אמי ורבי אסי לאפניהו.

The Gemara relates: **Rabbi Abbahu was sitting before the Sages and saying this *halakha* of Rav Dimi**, that the priest anointed for war serves in the same garments as the High Priest, **in the name of Rabbi Yohanan. Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi turned their faces away**^N to show that they disagreed. **Some say it was not Rabbi Abbahu but Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba who said it, and it was away from him that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi turned their faces.**

מתקיף לה רב פפא: בשלמא רבי אבהו – משום יקרא דבי קיסר, אלא לרבי חייא בר אבא נמרו ליה מימר: לא אמר רבי יוחנן הכי!

Rav Pappa strongly objects to the alternative account: **Granted**, if you say that Rabbi Abbahu reported the *halakha*, it is understandable that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi did not state outright that they disagreed with him **due to the honor of the house of the caesar**,^N as Rabbi Abbahu was close to the government (see *Hagiga* 14a). **But if the alternative account were true, then they should have said outright to Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba that they held that Rabbi Yohanan did not say this**, since there would have been no reason not to have done so. Therefore, Rav Pappa claimed this account must be incorrect.

כי אתא רבין אמר: נשאל איתמר. תנא נמי הכי: בגדים שבהן גדול משמש בהן – משוח מלחמה נשאל בהן.

The Gemara cites an opinion that conflicts with that of Rav Dimi: **When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: The teaching that the priest anointed for war wears the eight garments of the High Priest was stated only with regard to being consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim*. To be consulted he must wear all eight garments; however, he never serves in them. That was also taught in a *baraita*: The garments in which the High Priest serves are also worn when the priest anointed for war is consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim*.**^H

NOTES

Toward someone inferior to him he does feel animosity – בדיוטר מינה אית ליה: This observation is noted in several places in the Gemara. One feels animosity only toward someone who is less deserving and who nevertheless receives equal or preferable status.

Turned their faces away – לאפניהו...לאפניהו: The Sages would all sit facing the Sage who was currently expounding the *halakha*. When they wished to respond or show they disagreed, they would turn their faces toward the students who sat behind them.

The honor of the house of the caesar – יקרא דבי קיסר: Great respect was shown to the ruling government, even a non-Jewish one. For that reason, anyone who was close to the authorities was also treated with honor.

HALAKHA

The garments of the priest anointed for war – בגדי משוח מלחמה: When the priest anointed for war serves in the Temple, he serves in the four garments of a common priest. This is in accordance with the opinion of Ravin (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Kelei HaMikdash* 4:21).

HALAKHA

How does one consult the Urim VeTummim – ביצד שואלים – באורים ותומים: The priest stands facing the Ark, and the person who is asking stands behind the priest, facing him. The person who is asking states what he wishes to ask; he does not ask in a loud voice nor does he merely think the question in his head. Rather, he uses a soft voice, like one who prays alone. The Divine Spirit moves the priest, and he looks at the breastplate and sees a prophecy in the letters raised on it. The priest answers: Do this, or: Do not do that. One may not ask two questions together; however if one does, he is answered with regard to the first question alone (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Kelei HaMikdash 10:11).

NOTES

Toward the Divine Presence – כלפי שכניה: Rashi understands the Divine Presence as a reference to the Urim VeTummim. However, the Rambam understands it as a reference to the Ark (see Halakha note).

And he shall inquire for him – ושאל לו – The phrase “for him” is apparently superfluous here. It comes to emphasize that no one else should hear his question.

And he shall inquire for him before God – ושאל לו לפני ה' – If the verse had stated that the question is put to God, one might have concluded that thought alone is indeed sufficient, as God knows one's thoughts. However, the phrase “before God” indicates that he must turn to God only while his words are still audible (Maharsha).

תנו רבנן: ביצד שואלין? השואל פניו כלפי נשאל, והנשאל פניו כלפי שכניה.

השואל אומר: “ארדוף אחרי הגדוד הזה” והנשאל אומר: כה אמר ה' עליה והצלח. רבי יהודה אומר: אין צריך לומר “כה אמר ה'” אלא “עליה והצלח”.

אין שואלין בקול – שנאמר: ושאל לו, לא מהרהר בלבו שנאמר: ושאל לו לפני ה'. אלא בדרך שאמרה חנה בתפלטה, שנאמר: ויחנה היא מדברת על לבה.

אין שואלין שני דברים כאחד, ואם שאל – אין מחזירין אלא אחד, ואין מחזירין לו אלא ראשון, שנאמר: היסגורני בעלי קעילה בידו הירד שאול וגו' ויאמר ה' ירד. והא אמרת אין מחזירין אלא ראשון! דוד שאל

The Sages taught: How does one consult the Urim VeTummim? The one asking stands with his face toward the one who is asked, i.e., the High Priest or the priest anointed for war. And the one who is asked, the High Priest, turns his face toward the Divine Presence, i.e., the Urim VeTummim, in which the explicit name of God is found, by tilting his head downward toward it.

The one who asks says his question, e.g.: “Shall I pursue after this troop?” (1 Samuel 30:8). And the one who is asked answers him according to the response he receives and says, for example: Thus says God: Go up and succeed. Rabbi Yehuda says: He need not say the words: Thus says God; rather, it is sufficient to relay the content of the response and say: Go up and succeed, since he is obviously only repeating what he was told.

One does not ask in a loud voice, as it is stated: “And he shall stand before Elazar the priest, who shall inquire for him” by the judgment of the Urim” (Numbers 27:21), which implies that the inquiry is to be audible only to the person asking. And he should not think his question in his heart but should enunciate it, as it is stated: “And... who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before God” (Numbers 27:21), and immediately afterward it states: “By his mouth” (Numbers 27:21). Rather, how shall he inquire? He should do so akin to the way that Hannah spoke in her prayer, as it is stated: “Now Hannah spoke in her heart; only her lips moved, but her voice could not be heard” (1 Samuel 1:13), which indicates she did enunciate the words but spoke so quietly that no one else could hear.

One does not ask about two matters simultaneously; rather, one asks one question, and after he is answered he asks a second question. And even if he asks about two matters simultaneously, he is answered only with regard to one of them, and he is answered only with regard to the first question. As it is stated with regard to King David that he asked two questions simultaneously: “Will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hand? Will Saul come down?” (1 Samuel 23:11). And he was answered with regard to only one: “And God said: He will come down.” (1 Samuel 23:11). The Gemara asks: But didn't you say that if one asks two questions, he is answered only with regard to the first question? Yet the verse states that David received an answer for his second question, not the first. The Gemara answers: David asked the questions

Perek VII Daf 73 Amud b

NOTES

He was answered in order – והחזירו לו בסדר – The statement that one is answered with regard to the first question first means that one is first answered with regard to the logically first question, even if he asked it second (Ritva). In the Jerusalem Talmud a different explanation is cited, based on this verse: If one asks two questions he is answered only, if at all, with regard to the second question.

שלא בסדר, והחזירו לו בסדר. ובין שידע ששאל שלא בסדר – חזר ושאל בסדר, שנאמר: היסגורני בעלי קעילה אותי ואת אנשי ביד שאול ויאמר ה' סגורו.

ואם היוצר הדבר לשנים – מחזירין לו שנים, שנאמר: ושאל דוד בה' לאמר הארדוף אחרי הגדוד הזה האשיגוני? ויאמר ה' לו רדוף כי השג תשיג והצל תציל.

out of order and he was answered in order.ⁿ He should have asked first whether Saul would come down, and afterward what the people of Keilah would do. And once he realized that he had asked out of order he went back and asked in order, as it is stated immediately afterward: “Will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And God said: They will deliver you” (1 Samuel 23:12).

But if the matter is urgent and requires asking two questions simultaneously, there being no time to follow the standard protocol, one may ask both questions simultaneously and he is answered with regard to the two questions together, as it is stated: “And David asked of God, saying: Shall I pursue after this troop? Will I overtake them? And He answered him: Pursue, for you will surely overtake them, and will surely rescue” (1 Samuel 30:8).

ואף על פי שגזירת נביא חוזרת, גזירת אורים ותומים – אינה חוזרת, שנאמר: “במשפט האורים”.

למה נקרא שמן אורים ותומים? אורים – שמאירין את דבריהן, תומים – שמשלימין את דבריהן.

ואם תאמר: בגבעת בנימין מפני מה לא השלימו?

הם שלא ביחנו אם לנצח אם להנצח ובאחרונה שביחנו – הסכימו, שנאמר: “ויפנחם בין אלעזר בן אהרן עומד לפני בנימין ההם לאמר האוסף עוד לצאת למלחמה עם בני בנימין אחי אם אחרל ויאמר ה' עלו כי מחר אתננו בידך”.

ביצד נעשית? רבי יוחנן אומר: בולטות, ריש לקיש אומר: מצטרפות.

והא לא כתוב בהו צד? אמר רב שמואל בר יצחק: אברהם יצחק ויעקב כתוב שם. והא לא כתוב טי? אמר רב אחא בר יעקב: “שבטי ישורון” כתוב שם.

The Gemara notes the reliability of the *Urim VeTummim*: **Even though a decree of a prophet can be retracted**, as sometimes a dire prophecy is stated as a warning and does not come true, a **decree of the *Urim VeTummim* cannot be retracted**.^N **As it is stated: “By the judgment of the *Urim*”** (Numbers 27:21). The use of the term judgment suggests that the decree is as final as a judicial decision.

Why is it called *Urim VeTummim*? *Urim*, which is based on the word *or*, light, is so called because it **illuminates** and explains its words. *Tummim*, which is based on the word *tam*, completed, is because it **fulfills its words**, which always come true.

And if you say: In the battles following the incidents in Gibeah of Benjamin (Judges 19–20), why did the *Urim VeTummim* not fulfill its words? The Jewish People consulted the *Urim VeTummim* three times with regard to their decision to attack the tribe of Benjamin, and each time they were instructed to go to battle. However, the first two times they were defeated and only on the third attempt were they successful. Is this not proof that the *Urim VeTummim* does not always fulfill its words?

The Gemara answers: The first two times they **did not check** with the *Urim VeTummim* **whether they would be victorious or be defeated** but only inquired how and whether they should go to battle. Had they asked, they indeed would have been told that they would not succeed. **But on the last time, when they did check** and inquire whether they would be successful, the *Urim VeTummim* **agreed** with them that they should go to battle and that they would succeed, as it is stated: **“And Pinehas, the son of Elazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days, saying: Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin my brother, or shall I cease? And God said: Go up, for tomorrow I will deliver him into your hand”** (Judges 20:28).

How is it done?^N How does the *Urim VeTummim* provide an answer? The names of the twelve tribes were engraved upon the stones of the breastplate. These letters allowed for the answer to be received. **Rabbi Yohanan says:** The letters of the answer **protrude**, and the priest then combines those letters to form words in order to ascertain the message. **Reish Lakish says:** The letters rearrange themselves and **join**^N together to form words.

The Gemara asks: How was it possible to receive an answer to every question? **But the letter *tzadi* is not written**^N within the names of the twelve tribes engraved on the breastplate's stones. **Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak said:** The names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were also written there. The name *Yitzhak*, Isaac, contains the letter *tzadi*. The Gemara asks again: **But surely** the letter *tet* **was not written** on the breastplate, since it is not found in the names of the Patriarchs nor in the names of the twelve tribes. **Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said:** *Shivtei Yeshurun*, the tribes of Jeshurun, was also written there. The word *shivtei*, tribes, contains the letter *tet*. In this way the entire alphabet was represented.⁴¹

A decree of the *Urim VeTummim* cannot be retracted – **גזירת אורים ותומים אינה חוזרת**: The words of a prophet are stated before the fact and not necessarily in a moment of emergency. As one has the opportunity to consider and repent, the statements of prophets sometimes serve as warnings. In the case of the *Urim VeTummim*, on the other hand, there is no chance to affect the outcome, and therefore the answer given is precisely what will happen (*Me'in*).

How is it done – ביצד נעשית – The Ritva explains (see also the commentary of the Ramban to Exodus 28:30) that the *Urim VeTummim* was pieces of parchment on which God's sacred names were written. These were inserted into the folds of the breastplate, and they would cause the letters to light up. In the Jerusalem Talmud, an opinion is cited that the priest would hear the answer out loud.

Protrude...join – בולטות...מצטרפות – Rashi assumes that Rabbi Yohanan and Reish Lakish debate whether the letters remained in place and the priest had to decipher the message, or whether the letters would themselves form the answer. However, the Ritva assumes they do not disagree. Rather, first the letters would protrude, and then afterward they would rearrange themselves to form the words of the answer.

But *tzadi* is not written – והא לא כתוב בהו צד⁴¹ – Later commentaries ask why the Gemara does not ask about earlier letters in the alphabet, such as *het*; this question is also raised in the Jerusalem Talmud. Apparently, the Gemara's question is based on the message cited above from the book of Samuel, which included the letter *tzadi*. The Gemara's answer explains where the letters *het* and *kuf* came from; therefore, the Gemara proceeds to ask only about the letter *tet*.

HALAKHA

What was written on the breastplate – מיה כתוב בחושן – The names of the twelve tribes are written on the breastplate, along with the names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob written above the name Reuben, and *Shivtei Yah*, the tribes of God, written below the name Benjamin, so that all the letters of the alphabet are represented (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:7). The *Kesef Mishne* questions the source of Rambam's phrase

Shivtei Yah, since the Gemara here has *Shivtei Yeshurun* and the Jerusalem Talmud has *Shivtei Yisrael*, the tribes of Israel. The *Kesef Mishne* writes that perhaps the Rambam thought that it made no difference what the second word was, since the phrase was necessary only for the *tet* in the word *Shivtei*. Therefore, he chose a term that appears in the Bible (see Psalms 122:4).

Any priest who does not speak with Divine Spirit – כל כהן – שאינו מדבר ברוח הקדש See II Samuel 15, which recounts that upon his flight from Absalom, David wished to consult with the *Urim VeTummim*. He first asked Ebiathar to consult it, but he was not answered. David therefore removed him from the High Priesthood. Zadok was then installed in his place, and when he consulted the *Urim VeTummim* he was answered. The verse: “Zadok the priest who saw” (II Samuel 15:27), alludes to Zadok’s divine inspiration (see Rashi).

מיתביני כל כהן שאינו מדבר ברוח הקודש ושכינה שורה עליו – אין שואלין בו, שהרי שאל צדוק ועלתה לו, אביתר ולא עלתה לו, שנאמר: “וייעל אביתר עד תום כל העם” וגו’.

The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: Any priest who does not speak with Divine Spiritⁿ and upon whom the Divine Presence does not rest is not consulted to inquire of the *Urim VeTummim*. As Zadok inquired of the *Urim VeTummim* and it was effective for him, and he received an answer; but Ebiathar inquired and it was not effective for him, and he did not receive an answer. As it is stated: “But Ebiathar went up until all the people had finished” (II Samuel 15:24), which is taken to mean that he was removed from the High Priesthood since the Divine Spirit had departed from him.

סיועי הוה מסייע בהדיהו.

The Gemara asks: If it is true that the letters of the breastplate protrude or even join together to form the answer, why does the High Priest need the Divine Spirit and Divine Presence to be with him? And if he has the Divine Spirit and Divine Presence with him, why does he need the *Urim VeTummim*? The Gemara answers: The Divine Spirit assisted the *Urim VeTummim*. In other words, the letters formed the answer only if the High Priest himself was worthy, but his divine inspiration was not great enough to provide an answer without them.

“ואין שואלין אלא למלך.” מנא הני מילי? אמר רבי אבהו: דאמר קרא: “ולפני אלעזר הכהן יעמד ושאל לו במשפט האזנים” גוי הוא – זה מלך, “יכל [בני] ישראל אתו” – זה משוח מלחמה, “וכל העדה” – זו סנהדרין.

It was taught in the mishna: And the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim* only on behalf of the king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Abbahu said that the verse states: “And he shall stand before Elazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the *Urim* before God; by his mouth they shall go out, and by his mouth they shall come in, both he and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation” (Numbers 27:21). Each phrase describes a different circumstance in which the *Urim VeTummim* may be consulted: “He”; this is a reference to a king, as “he” refers to Joshua, who had the status of a king. “All the children of Israel with him”; this is a reference to the priest anointed for war, as all of the Jewish people follow him to war according to his instruction. “Even all the congregation”; this is a reference to the Sanhedrin, who are the heads of the Jewish people.

הדרן עלך בא לו כהן גדול

Summary of Perek VII

The chapter discussed the High Priest's public reading of the Torah. Since he reads from different places within the Torah, he must furl the Torah during the reading. The Gemara expands on this issue and discusses in what circumstances one may or may not skip over sections during the public reading of the Torah and the Prophets.

The chapter also focused on issues concerning the priestly vestments. The Gemara discusses whether the priests may derive benefit from them. It concludes that while in the Temple they may wear them and use them even when they are not engaged in the Temple service, they are not permitted to do so outside the Temple confines.

The precise order of the day is not fully explained either by the Torah or even by the Mishna. The Gemara draws on various sources to clarify the day's schedule. According to the Gemara's conclusion, following the daily morning offering, the bull and seven lambs of the additional offering of Yom Kippur are sacrificed. Then the High Priest begins the special Yom Kippur service which he performs in the white garments. He then changes back into the golden garments and completes the sacrifice of the remaining offerings of the day. Then, in the white garments, he reenters the Holy of Holies to retrieve the items he had left there earlier. He then leaves, and in the golden garments completes the day with the sacrifice of the daily afternoon offering. Upon the safe and full completion of the day's service, the High Priest returns to his home, accompanied by the people. He makes a party and rejoices with his friends to celebrate the successful completion of his mission.

Continuing its focus on the priestly vestments, the chapter discussed their creation: What materials are used, how the threads are spun, and many other pertinent *halakhot*. In addition, the Gemara considers some of the *halakhot* of the *Urim VeTummim* and how it is to be consulted. This includes the question of who may wear it in order for it to be consulted.

Introduction to **Perek VIII**

There are essentially two mitzvot of Yom Kippur that are relevant to all of the Jewish people: Refraining from forbidden labor and afflicting oneself. The concept of refraining from forbidden labor is well known from the laws of Shabbat and the Festivals. The verses in the Torah teach that those labors that are forbidden on Shabbat are the same ones that are forbidden on Yom Kippur. These can be defined as planned, thoughtful, creative work.

However, the mitzva to afflict oneself is unique to Yom Kippur. This chapter focuses primarily on the mitzva to afflict oneself: What is the definition of affliction? Is the required affliction passive or active? Who is included in the mitzva to afflict oneself? Is there an obligation for parents to educate their children in this mitzva? What about ill and weak people whose lives might be endangered by the mitzva of afflicting oneself? Are they obligated to fast under all conditions and situations? Perhaps there are exceptions because of the danger to their lives and well-being. Indeed, this question may be asked about all the mitzvot in the Torah. However, with respect to the mitzva of afflicting oneself, it is not merely a peripheral question but fundamental to the nature of the day. Therefore, this chapter is the place for clarification of the details of the mitzva and the laws of saving lives.

Another aspect of Yom Kippur is atonement from sin. This chapter investigates the parameters of that atonement: Is it always effective, unlimited, and unconditional? Or perhaps the atonement of Yom Kippur depends on one's actions or situation.

This chapter deals primarily with these issues and related topics.

מתני' יום הכפורים אסור באכילה, ובשתיה, ובחיצה, ובסיכה, ובנעילת הסנדל, ובתשמיש המטה. והמלך והכלה ירחצו את פניהם, והחיה תגעול את הסנדל, דברי רבי אליעזר, וחכמים אוסרין.

האוכל ככותבת הגסה, כמותה וכגרעיניתה, והשותה מלא לוגמיו – חיוב. כל האוכלים מצטרפין לככותבת, וכל המשקין מצטרפין למלא לוגמיו. והאוכל ושותה אין מצטרפין.

גמ' אסור? ענוש ברת הוא! אמר רבי אילא, ואיתימא רבי ירמיה: לא נצרכה אלא לחצי שיעור.

הנתיחא למאן דאמר חצי שיעור אסור מן התורה, אלא למאן דאמר חצי שיעור מותר מן התורה, מאי איכא למימר? דאיתמר, חצי שיעור,

MISHNA On Yom Kippur, the day on which there is a mitzva by Torah law to afflict oneself,^{NH} it is prohibited to engage in eating and in drinking, and in bathing,^N and in smearing oil on one's body, and in wearing shoes,^N and in conjugal relations. However, the king, in deference to his eminence, and a new bride within thirty days of her marriage, who wishes to look especially attractive at the beginning of her relationship with her husband, may wash their faces^H on Yom Kippur. A woman after childbirth, who is suffering, may wear shoes because going barefoot causes her pain. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. The Rabbis prohibit these activities for a king, a new bride, and a woman after childbirth.

The mishna elaborates: **One who eats a large date-bulk of food, equivalent to a date and its pit,^H or who drinks a cheekful of liquid on Yom Kippur is liable^H to receive the punishment of karet for failing to fulfill the mitzva to afflict oneself on Yom Kippur. All foods that one eats join together to constitute a date-bulk; and all liquids that one drinks join together to constitute a cheekful.** However, if one eats and drinks, the food and beverage do not join together^N to constitute a measure that determines liability, as each is measured separately.

GEMARA The Gemara expresses surprise at the mishna's terminology, which states that it is prohibited to eat and drink on Yom Kippur. Why does the mishna use the word **prohibited**, which indicates that these activities are only sinful? It is, after all, **punishable by karet** if he eats, and the mishna should have used the more accurate word **liable**. **Rabbi Ila said, and some say that Rabbi Yirmeya said: This term is needed only for a half-measure,^H** meaning that if one eats less than the amount that incurs the punishment of *karet*, he still violates a prohibition.

The Gemara asks: This explanation works out well according to the one who said that a half-measure is prohibited by Torah law even though it does not incur a punishment. But according to the one who says that a half-measure is permitted by Torah law, and that it is the Sages who prohibit eating less than a full measure, what is there to say about the terminology, as it was stated that *amora'im* debated the nature of a half-measure of a forbidden substance?

HALAKHA

איסורים – Prohibitions for the sake of affliction on Yom Kippur – **משום עינוי ביום הכפורים**: On Yom Kippur, it is prohibited to eat or drink, bathe or smear oneself with oil, wear leather shoes, or engage in conjugal relations. One is liable to receive *karet* only for eating or drinking (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 611:1).

המלך והכלה – The king and a bride may wash their faces – **ירחצו את פניהם**: The king may wash his face on Yom Kippur, in deference to his status, to allow people to see his beauty. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as the Gemara rules according to his opinion (*Hagahot Maimoniyot; Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shevitat Asor* 3:1). A bride is allowed to wash her face if Yom Kippur is within thirty days after her wedding. This leniency is not observed in modern times, as the entire community spends the day in the synagogue, where the husband does not see his bride (*Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 613:10).

The measure of food that determines liability for eating on

Yom Kippur – **שיעור אכילה ביום הכפורים**: One who eats on Yom Kippur an amount of food equal to the volume of a large date, which is slightly smaller than an egg-bulk, is liable. All types of food are combined to reach this measure, as stated in the mishna (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 612:1).

השיעור שתיה ביום הכפורים – The measure of liquid that determines liability for drinking on Yom Kippur – **שיעור שתיה ביום הכפורים**: One who drinks a cheekful of beverage on Yom Kippur is liable. All types of drink can be combined to reach this measure (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 612:9).

חצי שיעור – Half-measure – **חצי שיעור**: If one ate or drank less than a full measure on Yom Kippur he is not liable to receive *karet*, although such an act is prohibited by Torah law. One who eats or drinks a half-measure receives lashes by rabbinic decree. This ruling follows Rabbi Yohanan, in his dispute with Reish Lakish (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shevitat Asor* 2:3).

NOTES

Five methods of affliction – תמשה עינויים – There are five methods of affliction required on Yom Kippur. Eating and drinking count as one. The medieval commentaries disagree on whether all are mandated by Torah law (Rambam), or if only eating and drinking are Torah prohibitions and the rest are rabbinic (*Tosefot Yom Tov; Rosh*; see Rabbeinu Nissim).

Bathing – רחיצה: Because bathing is usually done with water, a separate prohibition against smearing with oil had to be specified. Some authorities distinguish between bathing, which is prohibited for any purpose, and smearing oil on oneself, which is prohibited only for pleasure (see Rav Shmuel Strashun).

Wearing shoes [ne'ilat hasandal] – נעילת הסנדל: Although the use of footwear was not yet universal during the time of the Mishna, it was more common in urban areas and sandals were the common form of footwear. By the time of the Gemara, shoes became commonplace and it was considered unusual to walk around barefoot. The Hebrew word *sandal* does not refer only to open footwear; wearing any kind of leather shoe is prohibited.



Ancient sandal found at Masada

If one eats and drinks, the food and beverage do not join together – האוכל והשותה אין מצטרפים – Commentaries ask why the Gemara does not simply say that food and beverages do not combine (see *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*). Some suggest that even according to the opinion that food and drinks do combine with regard to other *halakhot*, the issue is one's frame of mind with regard to Yom Kippur. For this reason, the question is presented from his perspective (see *Sifah Yitzhak* and *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).