

לְטוּמַאת בֵּיתוֹ.

אָמַר לִיהוֹנָן רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ: בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ דִּילְפִינָא מְמַלּוּאִים – הֵיִינוּ דְתַנַּיָא: זֶה וְזֶה מִזִּין עָלָיו כָּל שְׁבַע מִכָּל חֲטָאוֹת שְׁהִיּוּ שָׁם, דְּהוֹאֵי נִמְי הַזֹּאֵה בְּמַלּוּאִים. אֲלָא לְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ, דִּילְפִתְּ מַסִּינִי – הַזֹּאֵה בְּסִינֵי מִי הוּאֵי?

אָמַר לִיהוֹנָן: וְלִטְעָמִיךָ מִי נִיחָא? בְּמַלּוּאִים – דָּם, הֶכָּא – מִיָּם. הָא לֹא קָשִׁיָא, דְתַנַּי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: נִכְנְסוּ מִיָּם תַּחַת דָּם. אֲלָא לְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ, הַזֹּאֵה בְּסִינֵי מִי הוּאֵי? אָמַר לִיהוֹנָן: מַעֲלָה בְּעִלְמָא.

תַּנַּיָא בְּוִתְיָה דְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן, תַּנַּיָא בְּוִתְיָה דְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ. תַּנַּיָא בְּוִתְיָה דְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: “בְּזֹאת בָּא אֶהְרֹן אֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ” – בְּמָה שְׁאָמַר בְּעֵינָיו. מֵאֵי הֵיא – בְּעֵינָיו דְּמַלּוּאִים. וְמָה אָמַר בְּעֵינָיו דְּמַלּוּאִים – אֶהְרֹן פִּירַשׁ שְׁבַע וְשִׁמַּשׁ יוֹם אֶחָד, וּמִשָּׁה מִסֵּר לוֹ כָּל שְׁבַע כְּדֵי לְחַנְכוֹ בְּעַבְדוּתָהּ.

וְאִף לְדוֹרוֹת, בְּהֵן גְּדוֹל פּוֹרֵשׁ שְׁבַע וּמִשְׁמַשׁ יוֹם אֶחָד, וְשִׁנֵּי תַלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים מִתְלַמְּדֵי שְׁל מִשָּׁה, לְאַפּוֹקֵי צְדוּקִין, מוֹסְרִין לוֹ כָּל שְׁבַע כְּדֵי לְחַנְכוֹ בְּעַבְדוּתָהּ.

מִכָּאן אָמְרוּ: שְׁבַע יָמִים קוֹדֵם יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים מִפְּרִישׁוֹן בְּהֵן גְּדוֹל מִבֵּיתוֹ לְלִשְׁבֵת פְּרִיָּדְרִין, וְכִשָּׁם שְׁמִפְרִישׁוֹן בְּהֵן גְּדוֹל כֵּן מִפְּרִישׁוֹן בְּהֵן הַשּׁוֹרֵף אֶת הַפָּרָה לְלִשְׁבָה שְׁעַל פְּנֵי הַבֵּירָה צְפוֹנָה מְזֻרְחָה, וְאֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה מִזִּין עָלָיו כָּל שְׁבַע מִכָּל חֲטָאוֹת שְׁהִיּוּ שָׁם.

about the ritual impurity of the priest's home,ⁿ i.e., his wife. This is done lest he become impure through relations with a menstruating woman, which is ritual impurity lasting seven days. Therefore, he is removed from his home for seven days.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said to Reish Lakish: Granted, according to my opinion, that I derive the *halakha* of sequestering from the inauguration, that explains that which is taught in the *baraita*: With regard to both this priest engaged in the burning of the red heifer and that High Priest prior to Yom Kippur, one sprinkles upon him for all seven days^b the purification water mixed with ashes from samples from all the previous red heifer sin-offeringsⁿ that were safeguarded there in the Temple. The reason for this practice is that there was also sprinkling during the inauguration. However, according to your opinion, that you derive it from Sinai, was there in fact sprinkling at Sinai?ⁿ According to your opinion, why are the priests sprinkled?

Reish Lakish said to him: And according to your reasoning, does it work out well? At the inauguration, the sprinkling was with blood; here, the sprinkling was with water. Rabbi Yoḥanan answered: That is not difficult, as Rabbi Hiyya taught: Water replaced blood, but both have the status of sprinkling. However, according to your reasoning, at Sinai, was there sprinkling at all? Reish Lakish said to him: The Sages merely established a higher standard, and this sprinkling is not a requirement.

The Gemara comments: A *baraita* was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan that the sequestering is derived from the inauguration; and a *baraita* was taught in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish that it is derived from Sinai. The Gemara elaborates: A *baraita* was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan: It was stated with regard to the inauguration: “With this Aaron will come into the Sanctuary, with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering” (Leviticus 16:3). To what is the term: With this, referring? It is referring to that which is stated in the matter. What is the matter? It is the matter of the inauguration.ⁿ In the manner that the priest was prepared for the inauguration, so too is he prepared for Yom Kippur. And what is stated in the matter of the inauguration? It is that Aaron the priest withdrew for seven days and served one day, and Moses transmitted the Torah guidelines to him all seven days in order to train him in the Sanctuary service.

And throughout the generations as well, the High Priest withdraws seven days prior to Yom Kippur and serves one day. And two Torah scholars from among the students of Moses,ⁿ to the exclusion of Sadducees, who are not students of Moses, transmit the Torah guidelines to him all seven days in order to train him in the Sanctuary service.

From there the Sages said in the mishna: Seven days prior to Yom Kippur the Sages would remove the High Priest, who performs the entire Yom Kippur service, from his house to the Chamber of *Parhedrin*; and just as the Sages would remove the High Priest, so do they 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. And with regard to both this priest whom the Sages sequester prior to engaging in the burning of the heifer, one sprinkles upon him, for all seven days of sequestering, the purification water with ashes from all the previous red heifer sin-offerings that were safeguarded there in the Temple.

NOTES

לְטוּמַאת בֵּיתוֹ: The priest must have become impure by engaging in relations with a menstruating woman, because mere contact with a menstruating woman does not cause ritual impurity lasting seven days. The Gemara explains (see Rashi) that it is conceivable that he did so unwittingly, as there is no suspicion that he would engage in relations with a menstruating woman intentionally. In the Jerusalem Talmud, both Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish accept impurity of the home as a rationale for the sequestering of the priest. Both rationales, sequestering and potential impurity, are necessary. If sequestering were the only issue, it would have been necessary for the priest to leave his home only during the day. And if the impurity of his home were the sole concern, he could separate from his wife without relocating to the *Parhedrin* chamber. In addition, impurity of the home is uncommon and would not have been a sufficient reason to remove him from his home if it were not for the mitzva of sequestering (Ritva).

מִכָּל חֲטָאוֹת – מִכָּל חֲטָאוֹת: From all the previous red heifer sin-offerings – There was an effort made to keep residue from the ashes of every red heifer ever burned for the purpose of this purification. The Rambam writes in his Commentary on the Mishna that each day the priests would sprinkle purification waters made from the ashes of a different heifer.

הַזֹּאֵה בְּסִינֵי – Tosafot raise the difficulty that the Torah states explicitly that at Sinai: “Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people” (Exodus 24:8). One resolution is based on Onkelos’s Aramaic translation, in which he explains that the blood there was not sprinkled on the people but on the altar on the people’s behalf. Therefore, the verse in question does not indicate that there was sprinkling at Sinai (Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes; *Mitzpe Eitan*; see also Rabbi Eliyahu Mizrahi’s commentary on the Torah and *Mikhtav LeHizkiyahu*).

בְּעֵינָיו דְּמַלּוּאִים – The matter of the inauguration – In the Jerusalem Talmud, proof that the verse refers to the inauguration is cited from the fact that the Torah portion detailing the Yom Kippur service begins: “And God spoke... after the deaths of Aaron’s two sons” (Leviticus 16:1), referring to the death of Aaron’s sons who died during the inauguration, which indicates a connection between Yom Kippur and the inauguration.

And two Torah scholars from among the students of Moses – וְשִׁנֵּי תַלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים מִתְלַמְּדֵי שְׁל מִשָּׁה: If these were students of Moses, why wasn’t one Torah scholar sufficient? Perhaps it is merely a matter of: “Two are better than one” (Ecclesiastes 4:9; *Tosafot Yeshanim*). Others explain that two Torah scholars were needed in case the High Priest subsequently deviated from the proper performance of the service. In that case, the two would be eligible to testify that he had been taught properly, and he could not claim that he never learned the proper procedure (*Tosefot HaRosh*).

BACKGROUND

מִזִּין עָלָיו כָּל שְׁבַע – Sprinkles upon him all seven days – People and vessels that became impure by contact with a corpse must undergo a purification process that includes sprinkling of water mixed with the ashes of the red heifer.



Priest sprinkling on family with vessels

Water replaced blood – נִכְנסוּ מִיַּם תַּחַת דָּם – The author of the *Me'iri* suggests that perhaps before the first mixture of red heifer ashes had been prepared on the first Yom Kippur, the priests actually sprinkled blood on him, similar to the sprinkling during the inauguration, and the ashes of the heifer were used only later.

מאי – What is the meaning of the term and it says – ואומר: If proof may be cited from the verse: "As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you," why is the first proof necessary? In fact, without the first proof, the proof from this verse would have been insufficient because according to its plain meaning, it refers to the inauguration alone (Ritva; see *Gevurat Ari*).

ואם תאמר במלואים דם הקא מי, אמרת: נכנסו מים תחת דם. ואומר: "כאשר עשה ביום הזה צוה ה' לעשות לכפר עליכם," "לעשות" – אלו מעשה פרה, "לכפר" – אלו מעשה יום הכפורים.

והאי "בזאת" מיבעי ליה לגופיה, בפר בן בקר לתשאת ואיל לעולה! אמרי: אי לקרבן לחודיה – לימא קרא 'בזה' או 'באלה', מאי "בזאת" – שמעת מינה תרתי.

מאי 'ואומר'? וכי תימא יום הכפורים קמא הוא דבעי פרישה, כדאשכחן במלואים, אבל ביום הכפורים דעלמא לא; אי נמי, בהן גדול קמא הוא דבעי פרישה, אבל בהן גדול בעלמא לא – תא שמע: "כאשר עשה" וכו'.

תניא בותיה דריש לקיש: משה עלה בענן ונתקפה בענן ונתקדש בענן כדי לקבל תורה לישראל בקדושה, שנאמר: "וישבון כבוד ה' על הר סיני." זה היה מעשה אחר עשרת הדברות, שהיו תחלה לארבעים יום, דברי רבי יוסי הגלילי.

רבי עקיבא אומר: "וישבון כבוד ה'" – מראש חודש.

And if you say that at the inauguration the sprinkling was with blood, and here the sprinkling was with water, you said: **Water replaced blood.**^N And it says in the verse: "As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you" (Leviticus 8:34). To do, these are the actions performed in the burning of the red heifer; to make atonement, these are the actions performed on Yom Kippur. This *baraita*, then, is proof for the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan.

The Gemara analyzes the *baraita*. But the term: **With this [bezot], is required for the meaning of the verse itself;** the priest is required to bring a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering. The Sages say in response: **If the term comes to teach only with regard to the offerings, let the verse say: With this [bezeh], in the masculine, referring to the bull, or: With these [be'eloh], referring to the bull and the ram.** What, then, may be derived from the use of the feminine term *bezot*, which refers to neither the bull nor the ram? **Learn from it two conclusions;** one with regard to the offerings and one with regard to sequestering.

The Gemara continues its analysis of the *baraita*. **What is the meaning of the term: And it says?**^N Why does the *baraita* cite an additional proof from another verse? Why wasn't the first proof sufficient? **And if you say that it is on the first Yom Kippur when Aaron performed the service that the High Priest requires sequestering, as we find in the inauguration when the priests were sequestered before being consecrated as priests, but on Yom Kippur in general, no,** subsequent High Priests do not require sequestering; or alternatively, if you say: **It is the first High Priest who requires sequestering,** as did all the priests during the inauguration, but subsequent High Priests in general, no, they do not require sequestering before Yom Kippur; then come and hear that which it says in the verse: "As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do," meaning that this is a mitzva for all generations.

§ And a *baraita* was taught in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish that sequestering is derived from Sinai: **Moses ascended in the cloud, and was covered in the cloud, and was sanctified in the cloud, in order to receive the Torah for the Jewish people in sanctity, as it is stated: "And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai and the cloud covered him six days, and He called to Moses on the seventh day from the midst of the cloud" (Exodus 24:16). This was an incident that occurred after the revelation of the Ten Commandments to the Jewish people, and these six days were the beginning of the forty days that Moses was on the mountain (see Exodus 24:18); this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili.** The opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili corresponds to that of Reish Lakish; Moses withdrew for six days before receiving permission to stand in the presence of God.

Rabbi Akiva says: This incident occurred before the revelation of the Ten Commandments to the Jewish people, and when the Torah says: "And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai," it is referring to the revelation of the Divine Presence that began on the **New Moon** of Sivan, which was six days before the revelation of the Ten Commandments.

Perek I

Daf 4 Amud b

"ויכסהו הענן" – להר, ויקרא אל משה" – [משה] וכל ישראל עומדין, ולא בא הכתוב אלא לחלק כבוד למשה. רבי נתן אומר: לא בא הכתוב אלא למרק אבילה ושתיה שבמעיו, לשומו במלאכי השרת.

And that which is written: "And the cloud covered him," means the cloud covered it, **the mountain,** and not him, Moses. "And He called to Moses"; **Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing** at the foot of the mountain and listening, and if God did not mean that Moses was to climb the mountain, why did He call him? **The verse comes only to accord deference to Moses,** as the entire nation heard God address him. **Rabbi Natan says:** Moses was in fact called to enter the cloud; however, his entrance was not for the purpose of sequestering and purifying him, rather, **the verse comes only to cleanse the food and drink that was in his intestines, to render him like the ministering angels who require neither food nor drink.**

רבי מתאי בן חרש אומר: לא בא הכתוב אלא לאיים, עליו כדי שתהא תורה ניתנת באימה, ברתת ובועי, שנאמר: "עבדו את ה' ביראה וגילו ברעדה". מאי "וגילו ברעדה"? אמר רב אדא בר מתנה אמר רב: במקום גילה שם תהא רעדה.

במאי קא מיפלגי רבי יוסי הגלילי ורבי עקיבא? בפלוגתא דהני תנאי. דתנאי: בששה בחודש ניתנה תורה לישראל, רבי יוסי אומר: בשבעה בו. מאן דאמר בששה - בששה ניתנה, ובשבעה עלה (דכתיב "ויקרא אל משה ביום השביעי"). מאן דאמר בשבעה - בשבעה ניתנה, ובשבעה עלה, [דכתיב: ויקרא אל משה ביום השביעי].

רבי יוסי הגלילי סבר לה כתנא קמא, דאמר בששה בחודש ניתנה תורה, הלכך, זה היה מעשה אחר עשרת הדברות, "וישכון כבוד ה' על הר סיני ויכסהו הענן ששת ימים" - למשה, "ויקרא אל משה ביום השביעי" - לקבולי שאר תורה. דאי סלקא דעתך "וישכון כבוד ה'" מראש חודש, "ויכסהו הענן" - להר, "ויקרא אל משה ביום השביעי" - לקבולי עשרת הדברות, הא קבילו להו מששה, והא אסתלק ענן מששה!

ורבי עקיבא סבר לה כרבי יוסי, דאמר בשבעה בחודש ניתנה תורה לישראל. בשלמא לרבי עקיבא - היינו דמשכחת לה: בשבעה עשר בתמוז נשתברו הלוחות; עשרין וארבעה דסיון, ושיתסר דתמוז - מלו להו ארבעין יומין דהוה בהו, ובשסר בתמוז נחית, ואתא ותברינהו ללוחות.

Rabbi Matya ben Harash says: The verse calling Moses into the cloud comes only to intimidate Moses, to instill in him a sense of awe of the Creator, so that the Torah would be delivered with reverence, with quaking and with trembling, as it is stated: "Serve the Lord with awe, and rejoice with trembling" (Psalms 2:11). Apropos the end of the verse, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of "and rejoice with trembling"?^N Joy and trembling seem contradictory. Rav Adda bar Mattana said that Rav said: Where there is the joy of fulfilling a mitzva, there will be the trembling of the awe of Heaven there.

§ Apropos the interpretation of the verse with regard to revelation, the Gemara asks: With regard to what do Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and Rabbi Akiva disagree?^N The Gemara explains that their dispute is parallel to the dispute between these other *tanna'im*, as it was taught in a *baraita*: On the sixth day of the month of Sivan, the Torah, the Ten Commandments, was given to the Jewish people. Rabbi Yosei says: It was on the seventh day of the month. According to the one who said that it was on the sixth, the Torah was given on the sixth, which is the day of the revelation of the Ten Commandments, and on the seventh day of the month Moses ascended the mountain, as it is written: "And He called to Moses on the seventh day" (Exodus 24:16). According to the one who said that the Torah was given on the seventh of the month, it was given on the seventh and Moses ascended on the seventh, as it is written: "And he called to Moses on the seventh day."

The Gemara proceeds to link the two disputes. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili holds in accordance with the opinion of the first *tanna* in the *baraita*, who said that it was on the sixth of the month that the Torah was given; therefore, this incident occurred after the revelation of the Ten Commandments. That is why he explains the verse "And the glory of the Lord abode on Mount Sinai and the cloud covered him for six days" to mean that the cloud covered Moses, and He called to Moses on the seventh day to receive the rest of the Torah. As, should it enter your mind to interpret the verse as follows: "And the glory of the Lord abode" from the New Moon of Sivan; "And the cloud covered it," the mountain; "And He called to Moses on the seventh day," to receive only the Ten Commandments; didn't they already receive the Ten Commandments on the sixth of the month, and the cloud that was on the mountain already departed^N on the sixth of the month?

And Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that on the seventh of the month the Torah was given to the Jewish people. That is why Moses was summoned on the seventh of the month immediately after the revelation of the Ten Commandments. The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the Torah was given on the seventh of Sivan and Moses then proceeded to climb the mountain and remain there for forty days, that explains the calculation that you find: On the seventeenth of Tammuz the tablets were shattered, according to the standard tradition. How so? Calculate twenty-four days until the end of Sivan and sixteen days of Tammuz; they total the forty days that he was on the mountain. On the seventeenth of Tammuz he descended from the mountain and came and shattered the tablets.

NOTES

And rejoice with trembling – וגילו ברעדה – Rashi and *Tosafot* explain that this sensation is limited to the experience of revelation. Others explain that during Torah study, which causes the heart to rejoice, one should also be in awe of the Creator (*Tosefot Ri HaLavan*). In tractate *Berakhot*, however, the implication is that this is a more general principle, and that all occasions of happiness should be accompanied by trembling (Ritva).

With regard to what do Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and Rabbi Akiva

disagree – במאי קא מיפלגי רבי יוסי הגלילי ורבי עקיבא – This is not the standard usage of this phrase, as Rashi explains. Usually this question seeks to clarify the basis of the dispute. Here the basis for the dispute is clear. The Gemara here seeks support for each of their opinions in the interpretation of other verses.

The cloud had departed – נסתלק ענן – The cloud did not depart completely. It was only the thick cloud that enveloped the mountain during revelation that departed (Rosh).

NOTES

Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing and listening – מוֹשֶׁה וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל עֹמְדִין – Tosefot Rid suggests a proof that the people did not in fact hear God calling to Moses. Although they did not understand what was said, the people heard a sound that they understood to be God calling Moses.

The voice speaking to him, the voice speaking unto him – קוֹל לוֹ – קוֹל אֵלָיו – The Ran claims that the term: Unto him, is more emphatic than the term: To him, as the former indicates exclusively to him and not to others. The Ritva, citing the Ri, explains that the source of the emphasis in the verse is the repetition at the end of the verse: “And he spoke unto him,” indicating the exclusivity of God’s speech to Moses.

That it is incumbent upon the latter not to say it – שְׂהוּא – מִיֵּינִין לְאוֹמֵר דְּבַר לְחֻבְרֵי שְׂהוּא בְּבֵל יֹאמֵר – The author of the Me’iri adds support from the verse: “And he that is of a faithful spirit conceals a matter” (Proverbs 11:13). Even if the matter being conveyed is not secret, one should not disseminate it without receiving permission to do so.

HALAKHA

From where is it derived with regard to one who tells another some matter, that it is incumbent upon the latter not say it – מִיֵּינִין לְאוֹמֵר דְּבַר לְחֻבְרֵי שְׂהוּא בְּבֵל יֹאמֵר – If one tells something to another, the latter should not repeat the information to others unless the former explicitly instructs him: Go and tell others (Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, negative mitzvot 9; Magen Avraham; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 156).

אֶלָּא לְרַבֵּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי. דְּאָמַר שְׂשָׂה דְּפְרִישָׁה וְאֶרְבַּעִין דְּהַר. עַד עֶשְׂרִין וְתַלְתָּ בְּתַמּוּז לֹא אֶתְבּוֹר לַחֲזוֹת! אָמַר לָךְ רַבֵּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי: אֶרְבַּעִין דְּהַר בְּהַרֵּי שְׂשָׂה דְּפְרִישָׁה.

אָמַר מֶר: “וַיִּקְרָא אֶל מֹשֶׁה” – מֹשֶׁה וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל עֹמְדִין. מִסִּיעַ לִיהִ לְרַבֵּי אֶלְעָזָר. דְּאָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: “וַיִּקְרָא אֶל מֹשֶׁה” – מֹשֶׁה וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל עֹמְדִין, וְלֹא בָּא הַכְּתוּב אֶלָּא לְחֻלְק לֹו כְּבוֹד לְמֹשֶׁה.

מִיֵּיבִי: “קוֹל לוֹ” – קוֹל אֵלָיו, מֹשֶׁה שָׁמַע וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁמְעוּ! לֹא קִשְׂיָא: הָא – בְּסִינַי, הָא – בְּאֵהָל מוֹעֵד. וְאֵי בְּעֵית אֵימָא: לֹא קִשְׂיָא. הָא – בְּקִרְיָאָה, הָא – בְּדַבּוּר.

רַבִּי זְרִיקָא רַמֵּי קִרְיָא קַמֵּיהּ דְּרַבֵּי אֶלְעָזָר, וְאָמַרִי לֵה: אָמַר רַבִּי זְרִיקָא. רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר רַמֵּי, כְּתִיב: “וְלֹא יָכֹול מֹשֶׁה לְבֹא אֶל אֵהָל מוֹעֵד כִּי שָׁכַן עָלָיו הָעָנָן.” וְכְתִיב “וַיִּבֹא מֹשֶׁה בְּתוֹךְ הָעָנָן!” מִלְּמַד שֶׁתַּפְּסוּ הַקְּדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא לְמֹשֶׁה וְהִבִּיאוּ בְּעַנָּן.

דְּבִי רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל תֵּנָא: נֶאֱמַר כְּאֵן ‘בְּתוֹךְ’ וְנֶאֱמַר לְהֵלֵן ‘בְּתוֹךְ’, ‘וַיִּבֹאוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם’. מַה לְהֵלֵן שְׁבִיל, דְּכְתִיב: “וְהַיָּם לָהֶם חוֹמָה” – אַף כְּאֵן שְׁבִיל.

“וַיִּקְרָא אֶל מֹשֶׁה וַיְדַבֵּר” לְמַה הַקְּדִים קִרְיָאָה לְדִיבּוּר? לִימְדָה תּוֹרָה דְּרַךְ אֶרֶץ, שְׂלֵא יֹאמֵר אָדָם דְּבַר לְחֻבְרֵי אֶלָּא אִם בֵּן קוֹרְהוּ. מִסִּיעַ לִיהִ לְרַבֵּי חֲנִינָא, דְּאָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: לֹא יֹאמֵר אָדָם דְּבַר לְחֻבְרֵי אֶלָּא אִם בֵּן קוֹרְהוּ. ‘לֹאמַר’ אָמַר רַבִּי (מוֹסְיָא בְּרַיָּה דְּרַבִּי מוֹסְיָא מְשַׁמֵּיהּ דְּרַבִּי מוֹסְיָא) רַבָּה: מִיֵּינִין לְאוֹמֵר דְּבַר לְחֻבְרֵי שְׂהוּא בְּבֵל יֹאמֵר, עַד שְׂאִימַר לוֹ לָךְ אָמַר – שְׂנֵאֲמַר: “וַיְדַבֵּר ה’ אֵלָיו מֵאֵהָל מוֹעֵד לֹאמַר”.

However, according to Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, who said: There were six days of sequestering after the Torah was given and an additional forty days that Moses was on the mountain, the tablets were not shattered until the twenty-third of Tammuz, contrary to the standard tradition. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili could have said to you: The forty days that Moses was on the mountain include the six days of sequestering.

§ The Master said in that baraita cited above that when the Torah says: “And He called to Moses,” it means that Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing and listening. The Gemara suggests that this supports the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, as Rabbi Elazar said that when the Torah says: “And He called to Moses,” it means that Moses and all of the Jewish people were standing and listeningⁿ and the verse comes only to accord deference to Moses. From Rabbi Elazar’s statement it is clear that all of Israel heard the voice of God.

The Gemara raises an objection: The Torah states: “And when Moses went into the Tent of Meeting that He might speak with him, then he heard the voice speaking unto him from above the Ark cover that was upon the Ark of the Testimony, from between the two cherubs; and He spoke unto him” (Numbers 7:89). The Torah could have said: He heard the voice speaking to him; however, instead the verse said: He heard the voice speaking unto him,ⁿ indicating that the voice reached him alone. Moses alone heard God’s voice and all of the Jewish people did not hear it. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This case, where everyone heard God’s voice, was at Sinai. That case, where Moses alone heard God’s voice, was at the Tent of Meeting. Or if you wish, say instead an alternative resolution. This is not difficult; when God addressed Moses by calling to him, everyone heard; that which God subsequently communicated by speaking, Moses alone heard.

Rabbi Zerika raised a contradiction between verses before Rabbi Elazar, and some say that Rabbi Zerika said that Rabbi Elazar raised a contradiction: It is written in one place: “And Moses was not able to enter into the Tent of Meeting because the cloud dwelt on it” (Exodus 40:35), as Moses was unable to enter the cloud. And it is written elsewhere: “And Moses came into the cloud” (Exodus 24:18). This teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, grabbed Moses and brought him into the cloud since he could not enter on his own.

The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: There is a verbal analogy that resolves this contradiction. It is stated here: “And Moses came into the cloud,” and it is stated below, in another verse: “And the children of Israel went into the sea on dry land” (Exodus 14:22); Just as below, there was a path within the sea, as it is written: “And the water was a wall for them” (Exodus 14:22), here too, there was a path through the cloud, but Moses did not actually enter the cloud.

The verse says: “And He called unto Moses, and the Lord spoke unto him from within the Tent of Meeting, saying” (Leviticus 1:1). Why does the verse mention calling before speaking, and God did not speak to him at the outset? The Torah is teaching etiquette: A person should not say anything to another unless he calls him first. This supports the opinion of Rabbi Hanina, as Rabbi Hanina said: A person should not say anything to another unless he calls him first. With regard to the term concluding the verse: “Saying,” Rabbi Musya, grandson of Rabbi Masya, said in the name of Rabbi Musya the Great: From where is it derived with regard to one who tells another some matter, that it is incumbent upon the latter not to say it^{nh} to others until the former explicitly says to him: Go and tell others? As it is stated: “And the Lord spoke to him from within the Tent of Meeting, saying [Iemor].” Iemor is a contraction of lo emor, meaning: Do not say. One must be given permission before transmitting information.

Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina disagree – רבי יוחנן ורבי חנינא – In the Jerusalem Talmud, the opinions are reversed: Rabbi Yoḥanan holds that that failure to fulfill every detail of the inauguration invalidates the inauguration, and Rabbi Ḥanina holds that it does not invalidate the inauguration. According to this approach, the fact that Rabbi Yoḥanan did not respond to Reish Lakish and claim that in his opinion, failure to fulfill each detail does not invalidate the inauguration, is not a proof that he reconsidered his opinion. It could be that he was merely waiting to hear Reish Lakish's reasoning (*Yefe Einayim*).

מכלל דתרווייהו סבירא להו: מלואים, כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן. דאיתמר: מלואים, רבי יוחנן ורבי חנינא, חד אמר: כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן, וחד אמר: דבר המעבב לדורות – מעבב בהן, שאין מעבב לדורות – אין מעבב בהן.

After digressing to interpret the verses with regard to Mount Sinai, the Gemara resumes its discussion of the statements of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish. Based on the question Reish Lakish addressed to Rabbi Yoḥanan and the fact that Rabbi Yoḥanan accepted the premise of that question, we learn by inference that **both maintain** that with regard to the **inauguration**, failure to perform **all the details that are written in its regard invalidates** the inauguration. **As it is stated: Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina disagree.^N One said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates** the inauguration. **And one said: A matter that invalidates offerings throughout the generations invalidates** the inauguration; **a matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate** the inauguration.

תסתיים דרבי יוחנן הוא דאמר: כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן, מדקאמר ליה רבי שמעון בן לקיש לרבי יוחנן: אי מה מלואים – כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן, ולא קא מהדר ליה ולא מידי – תסתיים.

Conclude that Rabbi Yoḥanan is the one who said: Failure to perform **all the details that are written in its regard invalidates** the inauguration. This may be concluded from the fact that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish says to Rabbi Yoḥanan: **Just as with regard to the inauguration, failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates** the inauguration, so too is the *halakha* with regard to Yom Kippur, **and Rabbi Yoḥanan did not respond** and did **not say anything**, indicating that he agreed. The Gemara states: **Conclude** that this indeed is the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan.

מאי בינייהו? The Gemara asks: **What is the practical halakhic difference between** the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish?

Perek I

Daf 5 Amud a

אמר רב יוסף: סמיכה איכא בינייהו; למאן דאמר כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן – סמיכה מעבבא, למאן דאמר דבר שאין מעבב לדורות אין מעבב בהן – סמיכה לא מעבבא.

Rav Yosef said: The practical difference between them relates to the question of **placing hands^N** on the head of an animal brought as an offering. According to the one who said: Failure to perform **all the details that are written in its regard**, including details that do not invalidate offerings throughout the generations, **invalidates** the inauguration, failure to perform the **placing of hands on the head of the animal also invalidates** the inauguration. According to the one who said: **A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate** the inauguration, failure to perform the **placing of hands on the head of the animal does not invalidate** the inauguration.

ולדורות מנא לן דלא מעבבא? דתנא: "וסמך ונרצה" וכי סמיכה מכפרת? והלא אין כפרה אלא בדם. שנאמר: "כי הדם הוא בנפש כפר".

And with regard to the *halakhot* of offerings that apply **throughout the generations** the Gemara asks: **From where do we derive** that failure to place hands on the head of the animal **does not invalidate** the offering?^H The Gemara answers: **As it was taught** in a *baraita* that the verse states: **"And he shall place his hand on the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to atone on his behalf"** (Leviticus 1:4). **Does the placing of hands atone for one's sins? Isn't atonement accomplished only by the sprinkling of the blood, as it is stated: "For it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life"** (Leviticus 17:11)?

Rav Yosef said the difference between them relates to the question of placing hands – אמר רב יוסף סמיכה איכא בינייהו – A mnemonic based on letters in common was suggested to associate each opinion cited in the Gemara with the *amora* who stated it: Rav YoSef: *Semikha*, placing hands; Rav Naḥman: *TeNufa*, waving; Rav Pappa: *Perisha*, sequestering; Ravina: *Ribbui*, multiple garments (Rav Shlomo Cohen).



Placing of hands on the offering

HALAKHA

Failure to place hands on the head of the animal does not invalidate the offering – סמיכה אינה מעבבת – Although the one bringing an offering is obligated to place his hands on the offering, if he fails to do so, the offering

is still valid and effects atonement. Nevertheless, it is considered as though the individual did not achieve optimal atonement (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 3:12).