

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)?

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).

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

כְּאִילוֹ – As though he did not achieve optimal atonement – לֹא כִּפֵּר: Some commentaries explain that not only did the individual fail to fulfill the positive mitzva of placing hands, it is as though he did not achieve atonement. Nevertheless, his offering was not entirely in vain, as he fulfilled that obligation, and he is not required to bring another offering (*Tosafot Yeshanim*). Others explain that since the Gemara is discussing a burnt-offering brought to atone for failure to fulfill a positive mitzva, the question is whether the offering can atone for the failure to fulfill the mitzva of placing of hands as well. Their conclusion is that it does not atone for that failure, since the mitzva of placing hands is in effect until after the animal is slaughtered (*Tosafot Yeshanim*; see Rabbi Akiva Eiger).

Multiple [*ribbui*] garments and anointment [*meshiḥa*] – רִיבּוּי וּמְשִׁיחָה: Each of these two Hebrew terms has two meanings. *Ribbui* means multiple and also means greatness and authority; *meshiḥa* means anointment and also means greatness and appointment (see Rashi on Numbers 16:3; Exodus 29:29).

ומה תלמוד לומר: 'וְסִמְךָ וּנְרָצָה', שְׂאֵם עֲשָׂאָה לְסִמְיָךְ שִׁירֵי מִצְוֶה – מַעֲלָה עָלָיו הַכְּתוּב בְּאִילוֹ לֹא כִּפֵּר, וְכִפֵּר.

רב נחמן בר יצחק אמר: תנופה איכא בינייהו. למאן דאמר כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן – מעבבא, ולמאן דאמר דבר שאין מעבב לדורות אין מעבב בהן – לא מעבבא.

ולדורות מנא לן דלא מעבבא? דתניא: 'לתנופה לכפר', וכי תנופה מכפרת? והלא אין כפרה אלא בדם, שנאמר: 'כי הדם הוא בנפש יכפר' ומה תלמוד לומר: 'לתנופה לכפר' – שאם עשאה לתנופה שירי מצוה מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו לא כפר, וכפר.

רב פפא אמר: פרישת שבועה איכא בינייהו, למאן דאמר כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן – מעבבא, למאן דאמר דבר שאינו מעבב לדורות אינו מעבב בהן – לא מעבבא.

ולדורות מנא לן דלא מעבבא? מדקא תני מתקיניו, ולא קתני מפרישין.

רבינא אמר: ריבוי שבועה ומשיחה שבועה איכא בינייהו. למאן דאמר כל הכתוב בהן מעבב בהן – מעבבא, למאן דאמר דבר שאין מעבב לדורות אין מעבב בהן – לא מעבבא.

And for what purpose, then, does the verse state: “And he shall place... and it shall be accepted”? It teaches that if one deemed the ritual of placing hands to be a peripheral aspect of the mitzva and consequently failed to perform it, the verse ascribes to him status as though he did not achieve optimal atonement;^N and nevertheless, the offering atones for his sins. Apparently, failure to lay hands on the head of the offering does not invalidate the offering throughout the generations, as atonement can be achieved without it. Nevertheless, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, failure to lay hands on the offering invalidates the offerings brought during the inauguration.

Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The issue of waving the offering is the practical difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, failure to wave the offering also invalidates the inauguration. And according to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to wave the offering does not invalidate the inauguration.

And with regard to the *halakhot* of offerings throughout the generations, the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that failure to wave the offering does not invalidate the offering? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a *baraita* that the verse says: “He shall take one male lamb as a guilt-offering to be waved to make atonement for him” (Leviticus 14:21). Does waving the offering 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)? And for what purpose, then, does the verse state: To be waved to make atonement? It teaches that if one deemed the ritual of waving to be a peripheral aspect of the mitzva and therefore failed to perform it, the verse ascribes to him status as though he did not achieve optimal atonement; and nevertheless, the offering atones for his sins on his behalf.

Rav Pappa said: The issue of sequestering the priest for seven days is the practical difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, failure to sequester the priest for seven days also invalidates the inauguration. And according to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to sequester the priest for seven days does not invalidate the inauguration.

And with regard to the *halakhot* of offerings throughout the generations, the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that failure to sequester the priest for seven days does not invalidate the offering? The Gemara answers: It is derived from the fact that it is taught in the mishna: And they would designate another priest in his stead, and it is not taught: The Sages remove the designated priest from his house, despite the possibility that ultimately he might replace the High Priest and perform the Yom Kippur service. Apparently, sequestering is not essential.

Ravina said: The issue of the priest performing the service with the multiple garments of the High Priest for seven days and serving with anointment^N for seven days is the practical difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Ḥanina. According to the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration, failure to serve with multiple garments and anointment for seven days also invalidates the inauguration. And according to the one who said: A matter that does not invalidate offerings throughout the generations does not invalidate the inauguration, failure to serve with multiple garments and anointment for seven days does not invalidate the inauguration.

Consecrating the High Priest – הקדשת כהן גדול – After a High Priest is appointed, he is anointed with anointing oil and dressed in the eight priestly vestments. In the absence of anointing oil, the priestly vestments suffice to consecrate him (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 1:8, 4:12).

Donning multiple garments for seven days – ריבוי – *שבעה*: A High Priest is consecrated by donning and then removing the eight garments on each of the seven days. When there is anointing oil in the Temple, he is also anointed on each of the seven days (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 4:13).

ולדורות מנא לן דלא מעבבא? דתנא: "וכפר הכהן אשר ימשח אותו ואשר ימלא את ידו לכהן תחת אביו" מה תלמוד לומר?

And with regard to the *halakhot* of offerings throughout the generations, the Gemara asks: **From where do we derive that failure to serve with multiple garments and anointment for seven days does not invalidate the offering?** The Gemara answers: **As it was taught in a *baraita*: For what purpose does the verse state: "And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to serve in his father's stead shall make the atonement" (Leviticus 16:32)?** If it comes to teach that all service must be performed by the High Priest, it is already written with regard to the Yom Kippur service that it must be performed by Aaron, the High Priest.

לפי שנאמר "שבעת ימים ילבשם הכהן תחתיו מבניו" אין לי אלא נתרבה שבעה ונמשח שבעה, נתרבה שבעה ונמשח יום אחד, נתרבה יום אחד ונמשח שבעה מניין? תלמוד לומר: "אשר ימשח אותו ואשר ימלא את ידו" – מכל מקום.

Since it is stated: **"Seven days shall the son that is priest in his stead don them" (Exodus 29:30), I derive only that one who donned the multiple garments of the High Priest for seven days and was anointed seven days assumes the position of High Priest and may perform the service on Yom Kippur.** However, with regard to whether one who donned the **multiple** garments for **seven** days and was **anointed** for **one** day, or one who donned the **multiple** garments for **one** day and was **anointed** for **seven** days is thereby inaugurated as High Priest, **from where** are those cases derived?^H Therefore, **the verse states: "Who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated"; in any case he is appointed High Priest, even if either anointment or donning the garments did not continue for seven days.**

אשכחן ריבוי שבעה לכתחלה, משיחה שבעה לכתחלה מנא לן?

The Gemara asks: **We found** a source for the fact that when the High Priest is appointed, there is a requirement of donning **multiple** garments for **seven** days^H *ab initio*; however, **from where do we derive the requirement of anointment for seven days *ab initio*?** According to Ravina, there is a requirement to anoint the priest on each of the seven days *ab initio*, even though failure to do so does not invalidate the offering throughout the generations. From where is that requirement derived?

איבעית אימא: מדאיצטריך קרא למעוטה, ואיבעית אימא: דאמר קרא: "ובגדי הקדש אשר לאהרן יהיו לבניו אחריו למשחה בהם ולמלא כם את ידם" – איתקש משיחה לריבוי, מה ריבוי – שבעה, אף משיחה – שבעה.

If you wish, say: It is derived from the fact that the verse: "And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to serve in his father's stead shall make the atonement," is **necessary to exclude^N** requirements derived from other sources, i.e., that both donning multiple garments and anointment must be for seven days. Apparently, anointment for seven days is required *ab initio*. **And if you wish, say** instead that it is derived from **that which the verse states: "And the sacred garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him, to be anointed in them^N and to be consecrated in them" (Exodus 29:29). Anointment is juxtaposed in this verse to donning multiple garments: Just as donning multiple garments is required for seven days *ab initio*, so too, anointment is required for seven days *ab initio*.**

מאי טעמא דמאן דאמר: כל התבוב בהן מעבב? אמר רבי יצחק בר ביסנא: אמר קרא: "ועשית לאהרן ולבניו ככה" – "ככה" עינבא הוא. תינח כל

After ascertaining the halakhic distinctions between the opinions of Rabbi Yohanan and Rabbi Hanina with regard to the inauguration, the Gemara proceeds to analyze the rationales for those opinions. **What is the reason for the opinion of the one who said: Failure to perform all the details that are written in its regard invalidates the inauguration? Rabbi Yitzhak bar Bisna said that the verse states: "And so shall you do to Aaron and to his sons according to all that I have commanded you, seven days shall you consecrate them" (Exodus 29:35).** The term: **So**, teaches that failure to perform the ritual precisely in this manner **invalidates** the inauguration. The Gemara asks: That works out **well** as a source that **all**

NOTES

מדאיצטריך – קרא למעוטה: Perforce, since anointing lasts longer than one day *ab initio*, the number of days established is the number of days stated explicitly in the text, i.e., seven days. In this case, the principle: If you grasped the lesser amount, you have grasped it, applies. In order to derive a greater amount from the Torah one must cite absolute proof that this is the intention of the Torah. Otherwise, one can derive only the lesser amount. In addition,

the conclusion that anointing is seven days may rely partially on the second solution cited in the Gemara (see *Tosefot HaRosh*).

למשחה בהם – To be anointed in them: In fact, in this context the meaning of the term is greatness, not anointment. Apparently, the Gemara relies on additional sources that link anointment to the obligation of donning the multiple garments of the high priesthood (Rav Shmuel Strashun).

NOTES

Matters that are not written in that context – מִלְתָּא דְלֵא – מִלְתָּא דְלֵא: Rashi explains that the matter of placing the Urim VeTummim in the breastplate is not mentioned explicitly. Rabbeinu Barukh and Rabbeinu Tam, however, explain that it is clear that the sequestering for seven days is not mentioned in the two portions (*Tosefot Rid; Tosefot HaRosh*).

At the time of the incident – בְּשַׁעַת מַעֲשֵׂה: After Nadav and Avihu died, Aaron and his remaining sons were in acute mourning. Moses instructed them to eat from the offerings, despite the fact that generally a priest in a state of acute mourning may not partake of sacrificial meat.

And it is not from my own initiative that I am saying it – וְלֹא מֵאֲלֵי אֲנִי אוֹמֵר: In this very passage, Moses instructs Aaron and his sons to eat the meat of one of the sacrificial goats. Aaron counters by claiming that it is inconceivable that God would command them to eat from the sacrificial goat of the New Moon while in a state of acute mourning, and Moses concedes that Aaron is correct. That is why Moses has to emphasize that he is not instructing them to eat the other goats and the meal-offering at his own initiative or based on a derivation from the verses. Although the exchange between Aaron and Moses appears later in that portion, there is no absolute chronological order, in the Torah (*Tosafot Yeshanim, Tosefot HaRosh*).

Tenth of an ephah – עֲשֵׂרִית הָאֵיפָה: This usually refers to the griddle-cake offering and is brought by each priest on the first day of his Temple service. The High Priest brings this offering each day; half of it in the morning and half in the afternoon.

HALAKHA

Tenth of an ephah – עֲשֵׂרִית הָאֵיפָה: A priest begins his service in the Temple, and the High Priest begins each day of his service there, by sacrificing a meal-offering of one-tenth of an ephah from his own funds (see tractate *Menahot*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 5:16 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

מִלְתָּא דְלֵא דְכִתְיבָא בְּהָאֵי עֲנִינָא, מִלְתָּא דְלֵא דְכִתְיבָא בְּהָאֵי עֲנִינָא – מְנָא לֵן?

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: יְלִיף "פְּתַח" "פְּתַח". רַב מִשְׁרֵיָא אָמַר: "וּשְׂמֹרֶתֶם אֶת מִשְׁמֶרֶת ה'" עֲבוּבָא. רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: "כִּי בֵן צְוִיתִי" – עֲבוּבָא.

תְּנוּ רַבְנָן: "כִּי בֵן צְוִיתִי," "כְּאֲשֶׁר צְוִיתִי," "כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה'." "כִּי בֵן צְוִיתִי" – בְּאֲנִינּוֹת יֶאֱכֹלֶהָ. "כְּאֲשֶׁר צְוִיתִי" – בְּשַׁעַת מַעֲשֵׂה אָמַר לָהֶם. "כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה'" – וְלֹא מֵאֲלֵי אֲנִי אוֹמֵר.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסִי בַר תַּנְיָנָא: מְכַנְסִים אֵין כְּתוּבִין בְּפָרָשָׁה, כְּשֶׁהוּא אוֹמֵר: "וְזֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתָם לְכַהֵן" – לְהַבְיֵא הַמְכַנְסִים וְעֲשִׂיִּית הָאֵיפָה.

בְּשִׁלְמָא מְכַנְסִים כְּתִיבִי בְּעֲנִינָא דְבְּגָדִים, אָלָא עֲשִׂיִּית הָאֵיפָה – מְנָא לֵן? אֲתֵיָא "וְזֶה" מ"וְזֶה קָרְבָן אֲהָרֹן וּבָנָיו אֲשֶׁר יִקְרִיבוּ לָהּ עֲשִׂיִּית הָאֵיפָה."

matters that are written in the context of this topic of inauguration in the book of Exodus invalidate the inauguration. However, with regard to matters that are not written in that context,ⁿ but are written in the portion of the inauguration in Leviticus, from where do we derive that they invalidate the inauguration?

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: One derives a verbal analogy between the word opening that appears in the two portions of the inauguration. It is written in the command concerning the inauguration: "The opening of the Tent of Meeting" (Exodus 29:32), and in its fulfillment it is written: "The opening of the Tent of Meeting" (Leviticus 8:31). Failure to perform the matters written in both portions invalidates the inauguration.

Rav Mesharshiyya said: The verbal analogy is unnecessary, as the conclusion can be derived directly from the verse written with regard to the implementation of the inauguration: "And keep the charge of the Lord, that you not die, for so I am commanded" (Leviticus 8:35). The emphasis on this being the charge of the Lord comes to teach that failure to perform all the details mentioned in the implementation of the command invalidates the inauguration.

Rav Ashi says: The phrase: For so I am commanded, is the source from which it is derived that all the details written in both portions invalidate the inauguration.

Apropos that phrase, the Gemara cites a related halakhic midrash. The Sages taught: In the context of the implementation of the inauguration, three variations of the phrase appear: "For so I am commanded" (Leviticus 8:35); "as I commanded" (Leviticus 10:18); and "as God has commanded" (Leviticus 10:15). What does this repetition teach? From the phrase: "For so I am commanded," it is derived that even in a state of acute mourning, on the first day after the death of a relative, one must eat the offering. God stated the verse: "As I commanded," at the time of the incidentⁿ just after the deaths of Nadav and Avihu, when Aaron and his sons were in a state of acute mourning. And when Moses states: "As God commanded," he is saying: The command is from God and it is not from my own initiative that I am saying it.ⁿ

Apropos the matters mentioned that are not explicit in the portion, the Gemara cites that which Rabbi Yosei bar Hanina said: Trousers are one of the priestly vestments worn during the inauguration, but they are not written in the Torah portion. When the verse says: "And this is the matter that you shall do for them to sanctify them for My service" (Exodus 29:1), the superfluous word: And, which appears at the beginning of the verse, comes to add to that which was written previously and to include trousers and the tenth of an ephah^{nh} offered by a priest on the day that he begins his service.

The Gemara asks: Granted, trousers can be derived, as the verse is written in the context of the matter of priestly garments detailed adjacent to the portion of the inauguration. However, with regard to the tenth of an ephah, from where do we derive that there is an obligation to offer it during the inauguration? The Gemara answers: It is derived by means of a verbal analogy between the word this that appears in one verse and the word this that appears in another. It is written: "This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer to the Lord in the day when he is anointed, a tenth of an ephah" (Leviticus 6:13). And in the verse cited above in the context of the inauguration it says: "And this is the matter that you shall do for them," which teaches that there is an obligation to offer a tenth of an ephah during the inauguration.

Even failure to read the Torah portion of the inauguration invalidates the inauguration – אף מקרא פְּרָשָׁה מְעַכֵּב: Some commentaries suggest that the Gemara has returned to the matter of Yom Kippur and states that the High Priest would read the relevant passages from the Torah on that day. According to that reading of the text, like the other details, the *halakha* on Yom Kippur is derived from the inauguration (Rabbi Elyakim).

What was, was – מאי דהוה הוה: The commentaries explain that this question is raised in the Gemara when there is a good answer (*Tosefot Ri HaLavan*).

How will Moses dress the priests in the future? – כיצד מלבישן: Apparently, this indicates that following the resurrection of the dead, it will be necessary to consecrate the first priests to serve then as well as the Temple and its vessels (Rav Shmuel Strashun).

To explain the verses – למקבר קראי: It has been suggested that this question is tied to another dilemma (6a) raised with regard to whether the belt of the common priest was fashioned from fine blue or purple linen. If these dilemmas are linked, there is a practical dimension to this question (*Aguda*).

BACKGROUND

And he girded them with belts – ויחגור אותם אֲבָנִט: The image below depicts priests waiting to receive the garments worn during their service in the Temple. On the right a priest girds the belt on another priest.



Priests in the dressing chamber in the Temple

אמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי שמעון
בן יוחאי: מניין שאף מקרא פְּרָשָׁה
מְעַכֵּב? תלמוד לומר: "ויאמר משה
אל העדה זה הדבר אשר צוה ה' –
אפילו דיבור מעכב.

כיצד הלבִישָׁן? כיצד הלבִישָׁן!
מאי דהוה הוה! אלא: כיצד
מלבישן לעתיד לבוא? לעתיד לבוא
נמי – לכשיבואו אהרן ובניו ומשה
עמהם!

אלא: כיצד הלבִישָׁן למיסבֵר קראי?
פליגי בה בני רבי חייא ורבי יוחנן,
חד אמר: אהרן ואחר כך בניו, וחד
אמר: אהרן ובניו בבת אחת.

אמר אביי: בכתובות ומצנפת כולי
עלמא לא פליגי דאהרן ואחר כך
בניו, דבין בצוואה ובין בעשיה
אהרן קדים. כי פליגי – באבנט, מאן
דאמר אהרן ואחר כך בניו – דכתבי:
"ויחגור אותו באבנט" והדר כתיב
"ויחגור אותם אבנט". ומאן דאמר
אהרן ובניו בבת אחת – דכתבי:
"והגדת אותם". ולמאן דאמר אהרן
ובניו בבת אחת, הִכְתִּיב: "ויחגור
אותו באבנט" והדר כתיב: "ויחגור
אותם אבנט"!

Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: From where is it derived that even failure to read the Torah portion of the inauguration invalidates the inauguration?^N The verse states: "And Moses said to the assembly: This is the matter [*davar*] that God has commanded to be done" (Leviticus 8:5), teaching that even failure to perform the recitation [*dibbur*] of the Torah portion to the people invalidates the inauguration.

Ⓢ Apropos the inauguration of the priests, the Gemara asks: **How**, i.e., in what order, did Moses dress Aaron and his sons in the priestly vestments? The Gemara wonders: **In what order did he dress them?** That is an irrelevant question, as **what was, was.**^N The order in which Moses dressed the priests has no practical ramifications. **Rather**, the question must be: **How will Moses dress the priests in the future,**^N following the resurrection of the dead, when the Temple service will be restored? The Gemara rejects this question as well: **In the future, too, when Aaron and his sons will come and Moses will be with them**, he will know the proper sequence, and there is no point to raising the question.

Rather, the question is: **How did Moses dress them?** The Gemara seeks to explain the verses^N on this topic, as they appear somewhat contradictory. The Gemara responds: **The sons of Rabbi Ḥiyya and Rabbi Yoḥanan disagree with regard to this matter. One said: Moses dressed Aaron first and afterward Moses dressed his sons; and one said: Moses dressed Aaron and his sons simultaneously**, i.e., consecutively from one to the next, without interruption, to avoid changing the order prescribed in the verses.

Abaye said: With regard to the tunic and mitre everyone agrees that Moses dressed Aaron and afterward his sons, as both in the portion of the command concerning the inauguration and in the portion of the implementation, mention of Aaron precedes mention of his sons. **When they disagree, it is with regard to the belt.** The Gemara elaborates. **The one who said: Moses dressed Aaron and afterward his sons** derives it from that which is written: "And he girded him with the belt" (Leviticus 8:7), and then it is written: "And he girded them with belts" (Leviticus 8:13).^B Moses first dressed Aaron in all of the garments, including the belt, and then Moses dressed Aaron's sons. **And the one who said: Moses dressed Aaron and his sons, simultaneously** derives it from that which is subsequently written: "And gird them with belts, Aaron and his sons" (Exodus 29:9), indicating that Moses girded them all with belts simultaneously. The Gemara asks: **And according to the one who says: Moses dressed Aaron and his sons simultaneously, isn't it written: He girded him with the belt, and then it is written: He girded them with belts**, clearly indicating that he dressed Aaron and then his sons?

Perek I

Daf 6 Amud a

אמר לך: ההוא אבנטו של כהן גדול
לא זה הוא אבנטו של כהן הדיוט.

The Gemara answers that he could have said to you: **That verse comes to teach that the belt of the High Priest is not the belt of the common priest.** It is explicit in the Torah that the belt of the High Priest is made of fine blue and purple linen. On the other hand, the Torah does not state the materials used in the belt of the common priest, which was in fact linen like the rest of the garments of the common priest. And still one can say that Aaron and his sons were dressed simultaneously.