

**מתני' שבעת ימים קודם יום הכפורים מפרישין בהן גדול מביתו ללשכת פרהדרין, ומתקנין לו בהן אחר תחתי, שמא יאדע בו פסול.**

רבי יהודה אומר: אף אשה אחרת מתקנין לו, שמא תמות אשתו, שנאמר "וכפר בעדו ובעד ביתו" ביתו זו אשתו. אמרו לו: אם כן אין לדבר סוף.

**גמ' תנן התם: שבעת ימים קודם שריפת הפרה היו מפרישין בהן השורף את הפרה מביתו ללשכה שעל פני הבירה צפונה מזרחה, ולשכת בית האבן היתה נקראת. ולמה נקרא שמיה לשכת בית האבן – שכל מעשיה בכלי גללים, בכלי אבנים, ובכלי אדמה.**

מאי טעמא? ביון דטבול יום כשן בפרה, דתנן: מטמאין היו הבהן השורף את הפרה ומטבילין אותו, להוציא מלבן של צדוקין, שהיו אמורים במעורבי השמש היתה נעשית

**MISHNA** Seven days<sup>N</sup> prior to Yom Kippur the Sages would remove the High Priest,<sup>H</sup> who performs the entire Yom Kippur service, from his house to the Chamber of Parhedrin,<sup>L</sup> a room in the Temple designated specifically for the High Priest during that period. **And they would designate another priest<sup>N</sup> in his stead** to replace him lest a disqualification due to impurity or another circumstance beyond his control prevent him from entering the Temple on Yom Kippur.

Rabbi Yehuda says: The Sages would even designate another wife for him lest his wife die, as it is stated in the Torah portion of the Yom Kippur service: “**And it will atone for him and for his house**” (Leviticus 16:6); the Sages interpreted the term: **His house, that is his wife**. The priest must be married in order to fulfill this commandment. Due to the concern lest his wife die, another wife was designated to address that possibility. **The Rabbis said to Rabbi Yehuda: If so, that this is a concern, there is no end to the matter**, as what if the designated replacement wife dies? This possibility need not be a source of concern.

**GEMARA** The *halakha* of sequestering the High Priest prior to his performance of the Temple service on Yom Kippur is comparable to the sequestering of the priest designated to burn the red heifer. Therefore, the Gemara cites that which we learned in a mishna there, in tractate *Para*: **Seven days prior to the burning of the red heifer, the Sages would remove the priest who burns the heifer from his house to the chamber that was before the bira** at the northeast corner of the courtyard on the Temple Mount.<sup>H</sup> And that chamber was called the Chamber of the Stone House. The Gemara explains: **And why was it called the Chamber of the Stone House?**<sup>N</sup> It is because all the actions associated with the red heifer were performed in dung vessels,<sup>N</sup> stone vessels, and earth vessels,<sup>B</sup> which are vessels that cannot become ritually impure.

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** that they were so stringent with regard to the purity of the heifer? The Gemara explains: It is since a priest who immersed that day is fit for service and may perform the ritual of the heifer after immersion, even before sunset, as we learned in a mishna: **They would intentionally render the priest who burns the heifer ritually impure<sup>NH</sup> and immerse him immediately, to remove a misconception from the hearts of the Sadducees<sup>N</sup> by means of a public display of disregard for their ruling. As the Sadducees would say: Only by those for whom the sun set was the heifer ritual performed.** The Sadducees believed that it is prohibited for priests who began the purification process with immersion during that day to burn the red heifer until sunset, when the purification process is completed.

**HALAKHA**

Seven days prior to Yom Kippur the Sages would remove the High Priest – שבעת ימים קודם יום הכפורים מפרישין בהן גדול מביתו ללשכת פרהדרין, ומתקנין לו בהן אחר תחתי, שמא יאדע בו פסול. This is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. A replacement priest is designated in his stead to perform the service in case the High Priest is disqualified due to ritual impurity (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 1:3).

Sequestering the priest who burns the heifer – הפרשת בהן – השורף את הפרה: Seven days prior to burning the red heifer, the priest who burns it is sequestered. This is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. He is relocated to a chamber in the northeast corner of the Temple, to reinforce that the status of the heifer is like that of a sin-offering, which is slaughtered in the north. In the *Mishne LeMelekh* it is noted that the Rambam's

ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish cited in the Gemara, although the *halakha* is not typically ruled in accordance with his opinion (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 2:1–3).

They would intentionally render the priest...ritually impure – מטמאין היו הבהן – During the Second Temple period the practice was to render the priest who was to burn the red heifer ritually impure by contact with a primary source of impurity, e.g., a dead creeping animal. He would then immerse before engaging in the burning of the heifer. This was done to discredit the claim of the Sadducees, who, based on their rejection of the Oral Law, claimed that the priests may perform the ritual only in a state of absolute ritual purity (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Para Aduma* 1:14).

**NOTES**

Order of the tractate – סדרה של המפסקת: The *mishnayot* in tractate *Yoma* are arranged in chronological order. The tractate begins seven days prior to Yom Kippur with the sequestering of the High Priest and his preparation for the service on Yom Kippur. It then moves on to Yom Kippur eve and the night and day of Yom Kippur. The tractate opens with the number of days prior to Yom Kippur that the preparations begin (see *Tosafot*) to underscore the order of the events (*Ohel Moshe*; Rabbi Yosef, son of Rabbi Raphael).

And they would designate another priest – ומתקנין לו בהן: Although the replacement priest was not removed from his home, as there was a separate concern that precluded keeping the High Priest and his replacement in the same place (Jerusalem Talmud), apparently the designation process did involve fitting him with the priestly vestments for Yom Kippur, so that they would be available if the need arose (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

And why was it called the Chamber of the Stone House – ולמה נקרא שמיה לשכת בית האבן: Given that many of the Temple chambers were built of stone, apparently it was not named for its building materials, but rather for its function (*Siah Yitzhak*).

Dung [*gelalim*] vessels – כלי גללים: Rashi and most early commentaries explain that these are vessels made of dried cow dung. Some commentaries do not interpret *gelalim* as referring to dung; rather, they explain that it refers to a vessel made of great unshaped stones [*even galal*] (see *Ezra* 5:8; *Rabbeinu Hananel*; Rashi on *Shabbat* 16b, and others).

They would intentionally render the priest...ritually impure – מטמאין היו הבהן: See *Tosafot*, where it is explained that they would not render him ritually impure by Torah law, but would place their hands on his head, telling him: Descend and immerse. Due to their touch, he became ritually impure by rabbinic decree. Rashi in tractate *Hagiga* and the Rambam in his Commentary on the Mishna explain that they would render him ritually impure by means of contact with a creeping animal, which transmits impurity by Torah law.

To remove from the hearts of the Sadducees – להוציא מלבן: Although the Sages hold that one for whom the sun has set on the evening following his immersion is permitted to perform the ritual, and indeed one could assert that waiting for sunset would facilitate a more profound fulfillment of the mitzva, doing so would reinforce the claim of the Sadducees. Therefore, there was a concerted effort to publicly demonstrate that the Sadducees' opinion did not prevail. The dispute centered on the interpretation of the verse in the Torah that discusses the red heifer: “And a man who is pure shall gather the ashes of the heifer” (Numbers 19:9). The Sadducees held that the man must be pure of all ritual impurity, while the Sages maintain that it is sufficient if he is pure with regard to a specific matter, e.g., eating second tithe (see the commentary of Rav Shimshon of Saens on tractate *Para* 3:7).

**LANGUAGE**

*Parhedrin* – פרהדרין: From the Greek *πάρεδροι*, *paredroi*, meaning appointees, primarily over taxation, military aides, and the like.

**BACKGROUND**

Earth vessels – כלי אדמה: It should be noted that earthenware vessels, which do become ritually impure by Torah law, are also technically earth vessels. Why, then, do earth vessels not become impure? The difference is based on the materials used in fashioning the vessel and the methods of processing it. Earthenware vessels and earth vessels are made of different kinds of earth; furthermore, earthenware vessels are fired in a furnace, whereas earth vessels are merely dried in the sun (see *Tosefot Ri HaLavan*).

So that the ritual of the red heifer will have a distinctive indicator – דְּלֹהֵיוּ לָהּ הַיִּבְרָא: The priest must slaughter the red heifer and sprinkle its blood for its own sake. Although it is slaughtered on the Mount of Olives and not in the Temple, and therefore might not be considered an integral part of the Temple service, if it is not performed for its own sake, it is disqualified (Tosafot Yeshanim).

From where are these matters derived? – מִנָּא הֲנִי מִיָּלִי: This should have been the first question posed in the Gemara. Why does the Gemara instead begin by citing the mishna with regard to the red heifer? The *halakha* cited in the mishna could have been understood even without a Torah source, as it is reasonable that the High Priest, whose service atones for all of the Jewish people, would be sequestered from the people to sanctify himself for the Yom Kippur service. However, once the Gemara has established that the priest who burns the red heifer is also sequestered, where there is no such consideration, the Gemara seeks a Torah source (Penei Yehoshua).

תְּקִינוּ לָהּ רִבְנָן בְּלִי גִלְלִים, בְּלִי אֲבָנִים וּבְלִי אֲדָמָה; דְּלָא לִיקְבְּלוּ טוּמְאַה, כִּי הֵיכִי דְלָא לִיזְלוּ בָּהּ.

מֵאֵי שְׁנָא צְפוּנָה מְזוּרְחָה? בֵּינוּ דְחֻטָּאת הִיא, וְחֻטָּאת טְעוּנָה צְפוּנָה, וְכַתִּיב בָּהּ: "אֶל נֹכַח פְּנֵי אֱהֹל מוֹעֵד" – תְּקִינוּ לָהּ רִבְנָן לְשִׁבְחָה צְפוּנָה מְזוּרְחָה, כִּי הֵיכִי דְלֹהֵיוּ לָהּ הַיִּבְרָא.

מֵאֵי בִירָה? אָמַר רַבָּה בַר בַּר חֲנָה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מְקוֹם הָיָה בְּהַר הַבַּיִת, וּבִירָה שְׁמוֹ. וְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: כָּל הַמְקָדָשׁ בּוּלוֹ קְרוֹי בִירָה, שְׁנַאֲמַר: "הַבִּירָה אֲשֶׁר הִכְנִינוּתִי."

מִנָּא הֲנִי מִיָּלִי? אָמַר רַב מִנְיוּמֵי בַר חֵלְקִיָּה אָמַר רַבִּי מַחְסֵיָא בַר אִידִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: אָמַר קָרָא: "בְּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה בַיּוֹם הַזֶּה צִוָּה ה' לַעֲשׂוֹת לְכַפֵּר עֲלֵיכֶם." לַעֲשׂוֹת – אֱלוֹ מַעֲשֵׂי פָּרָה, לְכַפֵּר – אֱלוֹ מַעֲשֵׂי יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים.

בְּשִׁלְמָא בּוּלִיָּה קָרָא בַּפָּרָה לָא מְתוּקָם – לְכַפֵּר בְּתִיב, וּפְרָה לָאוּ בַת כַּפָּרָה הִיא. אֶלָּא אִימָא: בּוּלִיָּה קָרָא בַיּוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים בְּתִיב!

אָמַרְוּ: יָלִיף 'צִוָּה' 'צִוָּה'; בְּתִיב הַכָּא "צִוָּה ה' לַעֲשׂוֹת" וּבְתִיב הַתָּם: "זֹאת חֻקַּת הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה' לְאָמֹר," מֵה לְהֵלֹן פָּרָה – אֵף כָּאן פָּרָה, וּמֵה כָּאן פְּרִישָׁה – אֵף לְהֵלֹן פְּרִישָׁה.

That mishna continues: Since they would intentionally render the priest who burned the heifer ritually impure, the Sages in turn instituted the stringencies of utilizing dung vessels, stone vessels, and earth vessels, which do not have the capacity to become ritually impure, lest people come to treat the ritual with contempt and perform it in ritual impurity after seeing that the red heifer ritual was performed by one who immersed that day.

Apropos the mishna in tractate *Para*, the Gemara asks: What is different about the chamber located in the northeast corner of the Temple courtyard that led the Sages to house the priest performing the red heifer ritual specifically in that chamber? The Gemara answers: It is different since it is a sin-offering, as the red heifer is referred to as a sin-offering in the Torah, and the slaughter and sprinkling of the blood of a sin-offering must be performed north of the altar; and since it is written with regard to the red heifer: "And sprinkle it before the opening of the Tent of Meeting" (Numbers 19:4), and before the Tent of Meeting means on its eastern side. Therefore, the Sages established a chamber in the northeast so that the ritual of the red heifer will have a distinctive indicator;<sup>18</sup> this will cause the administering priest to be vigilant in its performance.

The Gemara asks with regard to the terminology of the mishna: What is the meaning of the term *bira* cited there? Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said: There was a place on the Temple Mount and its name is *bira*, and the Chamber of the Stone House was adjacent to it. And Reish Lakish said: The entire Temple is called *bira*, as it is stated in the prayer of David: "To Solomon my son grant a wholesome heart, to observe your commandments, your admonitions, and your statutes, to fulfill them all, and to build the *bira* for which I have made provision" (1 Chronicles 29:19).

With regard to the *halakhot* of sequestering the High Priest prior to performance of the Yom Kippur service, and of sequestering the priest designated to burn the heifer prior to performance of the red heifer ritual, the Gemara asks: From where in the Torah are these matters derived?<sup>19</sup> Rav Minyomi bar Hilkiya said that Rabbi Mahseya bar Idi said that Rabbi Yohanan said they are derived from Aaron and his sons, who remained in the Tabernacle for seven days prior to performing the service in the Tabernacle on the eighth day of their inauguration, as the verse states: "As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you" (Leviticus 8:34), meaning that this mitzva of sequestering was not limited to the days prior to the dedication of the Tabernacle; rather, it applies to future generations as well. The verse is interpreted homiletically: "To do"; these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer for which the priest performing the ritual is sequestered seven days in advance; "to make atonement"; these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur, before which the High Priest is sequestered seven days.

The Gemara asks: Granted, the entire verse is not established as referring exclusively to the red heifer, as: "To atone," is written, and the heifer is not capable of facilitating atonement; rather, it facilitates ritual purity. Rather, say that the entire verse is written with regard to Yom Kippur, as the rites performed to achieve atonement on Yom Kippur are similar to those performed during the days of the inauguration. What, then, is the source for sequestering the priest who is to perform the red heifer ritual?

The Sages say in response: Derive it from a verbal analogy between the terms commanded and commanded. It is stated here, with regard to the days of the inauguration: "The Lord commanded to do," and it is stated there, with regard to the red heifer: "This is the statute of the Torah that the Lord commanded, saying" (Numbers 19:2). Just as the term commanded there refers to the heifer, so too here, the phrase: "The Lord commanded to do" written in the context of the days of the inauguration refers to the heifer. And just as here, with regard to the inauguration, there is the principle of sequestering prior to performing the service, so too there, in the context of the *halakhot* of the heifer, sequestering is required prior to performance of the mitzva.

ואימא 'צוה' [צוה] דיוס הכפורים,  
דכתיב 'ויעש כאשר צוה ה' את  
משה! דנין 'צוה' דלפני עשיה,  
מ'צוה' דלפני עשיה, ואין דנין 'צוה'  
דלאחר עשיה מ'צוה' דלפני עשיה.

The Gemara asks: **And say** that there is indeed a verbal analogy; however, it is not between the red heifer and the inauguration of the priests, but between the term **commanded** in the context of the inauguration and the term **commanded** in the context of **Yom Kippur**, as it is written: “And this will be an everlasting statute for you, to atone for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year; **and he did as the Lord commanded Moses**” (Leviticus 16:34). In that case, only the sequestering prior to Yom Kippur can be derived. The Gemara rejects this, as a verbal analogy is derived only between functionally similar phrases. **One derives commanded that is stated before performance**, as in the portion of the heifer, **from commanded that is stated before performance** in the portion of the inauguration; **and one does not derive commanded that is stated after performance** in the portion of Yom Kippur **from commanded that is stated before performance**.

ואימא 'צוה' דקרבתות, דכתיב  
'ביום צותו את בני ישראל! דנין  
'צוה' מ'צוה', ואין דנין 'צותו'  
מ'צוה'.

Again the Gemara asks: **And say** that there is a verbal analogy between the term **commanded** in the context of the inauguration and the term **commanded** with regard to **offerings**, as it is written: “**On the day that He commanded [tzavoto] the children of Israel to sacrifice their offerings**” (Leviticus 7:38). The result would be that any priest sacrificing a communal offering would require sequestering for seven days. The Gemara rejects this: **One derives the term commanded from the identical term commanded, and one does not derive the term that he commanded [tzavoto] from the term commanded [tziva].**<sup>N</sup>

ומאי נפקא מינה? והתנא דבי  
רבי ישמעאל: 'ושב הכהן' 'ובא  
הכהן' – זו היא שיבה זו היא ביאה!

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **What is the practical difference** between the two terms? **Didn't the school of Rabbi Yishmael teach** a verbal analogy with regard to leprosy of houses between the verse: “**And the priest shall return [veshav]**” (Leviticus 14:39) and the verse: “**And the priest shall come [uva]**” (Leviticus 14:44)?<sup>N</sup> From that verbal analogy it is derived that **this is the halakha** with regard to **returning**, i.e., it is after seven days; and **this is the same halakha** with regard to **coming**, i.e., it is also after seven days. Obviously, the less pronounced difference in grammatical forms between *tziva* and *tzavoto* should not prevent the teaching of a verbal analogy.

הני מילי – היכא דליכא דדמי ליה,  
אבל היכא דאיכא דדמי ליה –  
מדדמי ליה ילפינן.

The Gemara rejects this argument: **This applies only where there are no terms that are identical to it; however, where there are terms that are identical to it, we derive the verbal analogy from terms that are identical to it**, rather than from terms that are merely similar.

'לכפר – אלו מעשה יום הכפורים.'  
ואימא כפרה דקרבתות!

§ The Gemara analyzes the verbal analogy from which the sequestering of the High Priest is derived. The Gemara states with regard to the phrase “**to make atonement,**” written in the context of the inauguration: **These are the actions performed on Yom Kippur**. The Gemara suggests: **And say** that it refers to **the atonement of offerings** in general, such that any priest engaged in sacrificing atonement offerings must be sequestered seven days beforehand.

NOTES

And one does not derive the term that he commanded [tzavoto] from the term commanded [tziva] – אין דנין 'צותו' מ'צוה': Many have asked: Doesn't the same verse that speaks of offerings begin with the words: “That the Lord commanded [tziva] Moses on Mount Sinai,” in which case the verbal analogy could be derived from two identical terms? One resolution explains that *tziva* in that verse refers to the offerings of an individual, while *tzavoto* refers to communal offerings. Since the Gemara here is dealing specifically with communal offerings (see Rashi and *Sifah Yitzhak*) it is clear why the derivation was attempted from that section of the verse (*Derekh HaMelekh*; see Rashash; *Eshkol HaKofer*; and others).

ושב – ויבא הכהן, ויבא הכהן: These verses address the *halakhot* of leprosy of the house. The verses might lead one to the conclusion that if the priest comes in the second week after the initial discovery of the leprosy and finds that the leprosy has spread on the walls of the house, he would order the demolition of the house. However, based on the verbal analogy, it is derived that the priest conducts himself in the second week as he did in the first week; in other words, he orders the affected area cut and that area of the wall plastered. The house is then quarantined for another week (see *Me'iri*).



BACKGROUND

Priestly watch and patrilineal family – משמרת ובית – אב: From ancient times, dating back to the reign of King David, the priests were divided into twenty-four watches (see I Chronicles 24:1–18). This division was maintained in the Second Temple era, although it was necessary to redivide the four priestly watches that returned from Babylonia into twenty-four watches. Each watch was divided into six. Once every twenty-four weeks each watch would travel to Jerusalem and serve in the Temple. On the three pilgrim Festivals all of the watches would congregate in Jerusalem to serve in the Temple, due to the greater workload on the Festivals. Typically, each patrilineal family that constituted the watch would serve on a set day of the week, with another family assigned to assist if the workload became onerous. Accordingly, most patrilineal families served in the Temple two days a year in addition to the Festivals.

NOTES

From a matter that is performed once a year – מדבר: This expression refers to the inauguration; however, it is imprecise, since the inauguration is not performed annually. A more precise formulation would be: When an inauguration is performed, e.g., the dedication of the Tabernacle, the First Temple, dedicated by Solomon, and the Second Temple, it is performed only once that year (Ritva).

And if you say we do not know – וכי תימא לא ידענן: In some instances, when relating to a verse that could be referring to either of two cases, the conclusion drawn by the halakhic midrash is to derive both. Doing so here would lead to the conclusion that sequestering is performed twice a year, contrary to the point of the Gemara. Here, though, it could be understood that the Gemara merely raises both possibilities, and ultimately Sukkot was preferred since its greater number of offerings render it more similar than Passover to the inauguration ceremony (Siah Yitzhak).

מי ידענן הי בהו מתרמי, דבעי ליה פרישה? אמרי: אלמה לא? ניבעי ליה פרישה לכוליה משמרת בית אב! דנין דבר שקבוע לו ומן מדבר שקבוע לו ומן לאפוקי קרבנות דכל יומא איתגהו.

ואימא רגלים! – דנין דבר שנוהג פעם אחת בשנה מדבר הנוהג פעם אחת בשנה, לאפוקי רגלים דלאו פעם אחת בשנה ניגהו.

ואימא רגל אחד! וכי תימא לא ידענן הי מיניהו, אי חג המצות – הואיל ופתח בו הכתוב תחלה, אי חג הסוכות – הואיל ומרובה מצותו!

אלא: דנין פרישת שבועה ליום אחד מפרישת שבועה ליום אחד, ואין דנין פרישת שבועה לשבועה מפרישת שבועה ליום אחד.

ואימא שמיני, דפרישת שבועה ליום אחד הוא! דנין דבר שאין קדושה לפניו מדבר שאין קדושה לפניו, ואין דנין דבר שיש קדושה לפניו מדבר שאין קדושה לפניו.

ולאו קל וחומר הוא? השתא דבר שאין קדושה לפניו – בעי פרישה, דבר שיש קדושה לפניו – לא כל שכן! אמר רב משרשיא: לא, הוה כתיב, כזה.

רב אשי אמר: מי איכא מידי דעיקר רגל לא בעי פרישה, טפל דידיה בעי פרישה? ואפילו למאן דאמר שמיני רגל בפני עצמו הוא – הני מילי לענן

The Gemara seeks to reject this suggestion from a practical perspective. **Do we know in advance which priest will happen to sacrifice a given offering, and who would consequently require sequestering?** The Sages say: **Why not?** There are certainly ways to do so. Each of the twenty-four priestly watches has set weeks during which it serves in the Temple, and the patrilineal families that constitute that watch have set days during that week on which each serves in the Temple. **We could require sequestering for the entire patrilineal family of the priestly watch designated to serve on that day the following week.**<sup>b</sup> The Gemara rejects the suggestion that all priests should be sequestered prior to sacrificing an atonement offering. **We derive a matter that has a fixed time during the year, Yom Kippur, from a matter that also has a fixed time, the inauguration of the priests for service in the Tabernacle, to the exclusion of offerings that are sacrificed every day.**

Again the Gemara asks: **And say that one derives from the phrase “to make atonement” the principle of sequestering prior to sacrificing atonement offerings on the Festivals, which have fixed times. The Gemara rejects this: We derive a matter that is performed once a year, the service of Yom Kippur, from a matter that is performed once a year,**<sup>n</sup> like the inauguration, which was a one-time event, **to the exclusion of the service on the Festivals, which is not performed once a year; rather, it is performed three times a year.**

The Gemara asks: **And say that the service on one Festival of the three, which is performed once a year, should require sequestering. And if you say: We do not know<sup>n</sup> which of them is the most significant and requires sequestering, since one could suggest that it is Passover, with which the verse opened, as the Torah always lists it first among the Festivals; or one could suggest that it is Sukkot, since its mitzva is to bring numerous offerings, many more than the number brought on the other Festivals.**

Rather, the Gemara rejects this possibility and explains: **One derives sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day, Yom Kippur, from sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day, the inauguration. And one does not derive sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for seven days, a Festival, from sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day, the inauguration. Therefore, atonement offerings on Festivals are not derived from the inauguration.**

The Gemara asks: **And say that the sequestering for seven days is prior to the festival of the Eighth Day of Assembly, as that would also be sequestering for seven days prior to performing a service for one day. The Gemara rejects this: One derives a matter before which there is not sanctity, Yom Kippur, which is preceded by weekdays, from a matter before which there is not sanctity, the day of the inauguration, which was also preceded by weekdays. And we do not derive a matter before which there is sanctity, the Eighth Day of Assembly, which is preceded by the seven days of Sukkot, from a matter before which there is not sanctity.**

The Gemara challenges this: **And is it not an a fortiori inference? Now, if a matter before which there is not sanctity requires sequestering, due to its sanctity, then with regard to a matter before which there is sanctity, all the more so is it not clear that it should require sequestering?** Rav Mesharshiyya said in rejection of this challenge: **No, there is no a fortiori inference here, as the verse: “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you” (Leviticus 8:34), is written to emphasize specifically a day like this day; precisely as it was for the inauguration, and not in any other situation.**

Rav Ashi said: There is another reason why it could not be that sequestering is required prior to the Eighth Day of Assembly. **Is there any matter where the primary Festival, the first day of Sukkot, does not require sequestering, as was already proven, while that which is secondary to it requires sequestering?** Since the Eighth Day of Assembly is an addendum to Sukkot, could its sanctity and stringency be greater than that which is associated with the primary Festival? **And even according to the one who said: The Eighth Day of Assembly is a Festival in and of itself and is not part of the festival of Sukkot, that applies only to the matter of**