

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 מעכב? תלמוד לומר: "ויאמר משה אל העדה זה הדבר אשר צוה ה'" – אפילו דיבור מעכב.

Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai: From where is it derived that even failure to read the Torah portion of the inauguration invalidates the inauguration?<sup>N</sup> 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.

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

§ 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**.<sup>N</sup> 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**,<sup>N</sup> 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.

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

Rather, the question is: **How did Moses dress them?** The Gemara seeks to explain the verses<sup>N</sup> on this topic, as they appear somewhat contradictory. The Gemara responds: **The sons of Rabbi Hiyya and Rabbi Yohanan 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.

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

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).<sup>B</sup> 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.

It is necessary only to state that Moses girded Aaron first – לא צריכא דאקדים – Some commentaries suggest that the verse is phrased in the plural to teach that had Moses dressed the sons before Aaron unwittingly or intentionally, that would not have invalidated the ritual (Peirush Kadmon).

**Why do the Sages remove him – למה מפרישין** – The Gemara is posing this question according to the opinions of both Rabbi Yohanan and Reish Lakish. According to Rabbi Yohanan's opinion, the priests could return home at night and accomplish the same objective. According to Reish Lakish's approach that the sequestering was to separate him from his wife, six days would have sufficed (see Jerusalem Talmud; *Siah Yitzhak*).

**Why did he withdraw from his house, i.e., his wife – מביתו למה פירש** – Rashi writes that the question is: Why doesn't his wife join him in the *Parhedrin* chamber? Others, citing Rashi, suggest that the question is: Why doesn't the High Priest return home to his wife each evening (*Tosafot Yeshanim*, citing Rabbeinu Yitzhak; *Tosafot HaRosh*, citing the Rabbi Yehuda bar Natan, who cited his father-in-law, Rashi). Yet others explain that the suggestion is that his wife should accompany him for companionship but not for intimacy. Even if he forgets and has relations with her, he can still purify himself the next day (*Tosafot Rid*).

**She will be found to be in a situation of uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman – ותמצא ספק נדה** – The Maharsha asks: Why did the Gemara say that the concern is lest the woman enter into a state of uncertainty, and not lest she become a menstruating woman with regard to whom there is no uncertainty? *Tosafot* in tractate *Nidda* and *Tosafot Yeshanim* address this point and claim that in order for the woman to have the status of a menstruating woman with regard to whom there is no uncertainty, menstruation must begin at the precise moment of the relations, which is unlikely. In contrast, the possibility that the wife would become a menstruating woman sometime after engaging in relations is more realistic.

## HALAKHA

**Why do the Sages remove the High Priest from his house – מדוע מפרישין בהן גדול מביתו** – The High Priest is removed from his house and separated from his wife seven days before Yom Kippur, lest she be found to be a menstruating woman and render him impure during that week (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 1:3).

**Retroactive impurity from menstruation – טומאת נדה** – למה פריש: A woman who impurifies retroactively does not render one who had relations with her impure for seven days. His legal status is that of one who came into contact with a menstruating woman and he is impure for one day, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis in their dispute with Rabbi Akiva (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Metamei Mishkav UMoshav* 3:8; *Kesef Mishne*).

ולמאן דאמר אהרן ואחר כך בניו, והתגיב: "והגרת אותם אבנט!" אמר לך: יהוא קא משמע לן אבנטו של בהן גדול זהו אבנטו של בהן הדיוט.

"ויחגור אותו אבנט" ו"ויחגור אותם" למה לוי שמע מינה: אהרן ואחר כך בניו. ובבת אחת מי משבחת לה? לא צריכא דאקדים.

"מפרישין בהן גדול" וכו'. למה מפרישין? למה מפרישין? בדקאמרין, אי לרבי יוחנן בדאית ליה, אי לרש לקיש בדאית ליה!

הכי קאמר: מביתו למה פירש? תנא, רבי יהודה בן בתירה אומר: שמה תמצא אשתו ספק נדה, ויבא עליה.

אטו ברשיעי עסקינן? אלא שמה יבא על אשתו, ותמצא ספק נדה.

אמרוה רבנן קמיה דרב חסדא: במאן – כרבי עקיבא, דאמר: נדה מטמאה את בועלה, דאי רבנן, הא אמרי: אין נדה מטמאה את בועלה!

The Gemara asks: **And according to the one who said that Moses dressed Aaron first and then his sons, is it not written: "And you will gird them with belts,"** indicating that they were girded simultaneously? The Gemara responds that he could have said to you: **That verse teaches us that the belt of the High Priest is identical to the belt of the common priest.** Both of them were from fine blue and purple linen. Therefore, although the Torah distinguishes between the girding of the belts, as Moses dressed Aaron before he dressed Aaron's sons, there was a common command to make both belts, indicating that they were made of the same material.

The Gemara asks: If they are identical, **why do I need both the verse: "And he girded him with a belt," and the verse: "And he girded them?"** The Gemara explains: **Learn from it that Moses dressed Aaron first and then dressed his sons.** The Gemara asks: **And can you find a situation where Moses could have girded Aaron and his sons simultaneously?** The Gemara explains: **It is necessary only to state that Moses girded Aaron first<sup>N</sup> and then proceeded to gird his sons in order of their significance.** After girding Aaron he did not dress Aaron in any other garments before girding his sons.

Ⓢ After a long digression in which many peripheral issues were addressed, the Gemara returns to interpreting the mishna. It was taught in the mishna: The Sages would **remove the High Priest from his house to the Chamber of Parhedrin.** The Gemara asks: **Why do the Sages remove him?**<sup>NH</sup> The Gemara asks in astonishment: **Why do the Sages remove him?** It is as we stated above: **Whether it is according to Rabbi Yohanan, as per his opinion: Sequestering of the High Priest is derived from the sequestering prior to the inauguration; or whether it is according to Reish Lakish, as per his opinion: Sequestering of the High Priest is derived from sequestering at Sinai, the answer is clear.** What is the point of the Gemara's question?

The Gemara explains: **This is what the Gemara is saying. Why did he withdraw from his house, i.e., his wife?**<sup>N</sup> The Gemara explained why he must be removed to a special location; but why doesn't his wife join him? **It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: It is due to the concern lest his wife be found to be in a situation of uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman, and he will have relations with her and become impure.**

The Gemara asks in astonishment: **Is that to say that we are dealing with wicked people?** Will the High Priest, aware of the uncertain status of his wife, have relations with her? **Rather,** rephrase the statement: **It is due to the concern lest he have relations with his wife and then she be found to be in a situation of uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman.**<sup>N</sup> In a case where blood is found on the sheets after the couple engaged in relations, and there is uncertainty as to whether or not the High Priest had relations with his wife while she had the halakhic status of a menstruating woman, the status of the High Priest is one of uncertain impurity.

The Sages stated the following assumption before Rav Hisda: **In accordance with whose opinion is that a reason for concern? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: A menstruating woman who found blood on the sheets within twenty-fours after having relations, creating uncertainty with regard to her status when she engaged in relations, renders the man who had with relations with her retroactively impure.**<sup>H</sup> As, if it were in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, it is difficult: **Didn't they say that a woman with regard to whom there is uncertainty as to whether or not she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman does not render the man who had with relations with her retroactively impure.** Therefore, the High Priest need not leave his wife during the week prior to Yom Kippur.

אמר להו רב חסדא: אפילו תימרו רבנן, עד כאן לא פליגי רבנן עליה דרבני עקיבא – אלא באחר אחר, אבל בחד אחר – מודו ליה.

Rav Hisda said to the Sages: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Akiva with regard to retroactive impurity only in a case where blood was discovered on the sheets long afterward, after there was time for the woman to leave the bed and bathe and only then discover the blood. Due to the time that elapsed, the Rabbis hold that there is no way to prove a connection between when the woman menstruated and when they engaged in relations. However, if the blood was found merely afterward, the Rabbis concede to Rabbi Akiva that she renders the man retroactively impure.

אמר רבי זירא, שמע מינה: בועל נדה אינו כנדה וטובל ביום.

Rabbi Zeira said: Learn from it that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is unlike a menstruating woman in terms of the time of immersion. Unlike the woman, who immerses after nightfall following the seventh day after her menstruation ceased, such a man may immerse on the seventh day and need not wait for nightfall. Therefore, if a High Priest has relations with his wife just before he is sequestered and there is uncertainty as to whether she has the halakhic status of a menstruating woman, the seventh day of his impurity occurs on Yom Kippur eve. He immerses himself that day and completes the purification process at nightfall. This allows him to enter the Temple to perform the Yom Kippur service.

דאי אמרת בועל נדה כנדה, אימת טביל – בליליא, למחר הכי עביד עבודה? והא בעי הערב השמש! אלא לאו שמע מינה: בועל נדה אינו כנדה.

As, if you say that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is like a menstruating woman in terms of the time of immersion, when does he immerse? He may immerse only at night after seven complete days. Since that night is Yom Kippur, how can he perform the Yom Kippur service the next day? Isn't he required to wait for sunset following his immersion to complete the purification process? Until then his status is that of one who immersed that day, who may not serve in the Temple until the nightfall following his immersion. Rather, must one not conclude from it that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is unlike a menstruating woman in terms of the time of immersion? He immerses on the seventh day, Yom Kippur eve, and at nightfall he may serve in the Temple.

רב שימי מנהרדעא אמר: אפילו תימא בועל נדה כנדה – דמפרשני ליה שעה אחת סמוך לשקיעת החמה.

Rav Shimi from Neharde'a says: Even if you say that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman is like a menstruating woman with regard to the time of immersion, the High Priest is not removed from his house at night. Rather, we sequester him one hour just before sunset on the eighth day prior to Yom Kippur, slightly before the start of the seven-day period, leaving seven full days to count prior to Yom Kippur. Although he is removed from his house more than seven days prior to Yom Kippur, that slight addition is not sufficient to have the period considered eight days.

מיתבי: כל חיבי טבילות טבילתן ביום, נדה ויולדת – טבילתן בלילה. נדה – אין, בועל נדה – לא!

The Gemara raises an objection to the opinion that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman immerses at night: With regard to all those obligated in immersions, their immersion is during the day. The exceptions are a menstruating woman and a woman after childbirth, whose immersion is at night. It can be learned by inference: With regard to a menstruating woman, yes, she immerses at night; with regard to one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman, no, he does not immerse at night.

נדה, וכל דאתי מרבוייא.

The Gemara rejects that proof because the term menstruating woman in that baraita includes the woman and everyone whose inclusion in the impurity is derived from her status. The understanding is that a man who has relations with a menstruating woman assumes her impurity, and therefore his immersion would be identical to hers.

NOTES

The halakhic status of one who is impure due to a seminal emission is like that of one who came into contact with a creeping animal – **בַּעַל קְרִי כְּמַגַּע שָׂרָץ**: The Gemara in tractate *Pesahim* explains that the two cases have an additional feature in common. One who comes into contact with a creeping animal becomes impure whether the contact was unwitting, intentional, or due to circumstances beyond his control. The same is true for a man who experiences a seminal emission, whether unwittingly or due to circumstances beyond his control (Rosh; Ritva).

מִיִּתְיָבִי: בַּעַל קְרִי כְּמַגַּע שָׂרָץ, בּוֹעֵל נֶדֶה כְּטִמְאָה מֵת. מֵאֵי לָאוּ – לְטַבִּילָהּ? לֹא, לְטוֹמְאָתָן.

The Gemara raises another **objection**: The halakhic status of one who is ritually impure due to a **seminal emission** is like that of one who came into **contact with a creeping animal**,<sup>N</sup> whereas the legal status of one who is ritually impure because he **had relations with a menstruating woman** is like that of one who became **impure** with ritual impurity imparted by a **corpse**. The Gemara asks: **What**, does the *baraita* **not** mean that one who had relations with a menstruating woman is like one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse in terms of **immersion**, which he may perform during the day? The Gemara rejects that conclusion. **No**, the *baraita* is merely comparing the duration of **their impurity**. One who experiences a seminal emission is impure for one day, like one who came into contact with a creeping animal; one who has relations with a menstruating woman is impure for seven days, like one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse.

טוֹמְאָתָן?! בְּהִדְיָא כְּתִיב בְּהוּ! הֵאֵי טוֹמְאָת שְׂבָעָה כְּתִיב בֵּיהּ, וְהֵאֵי טוֹמְאָת שְׂבָעָה כְּתִיב בֵּיהּ!

The Gemara wonders: For what purpose would the *baraita* come to teach the duration of **their impurity**? The Torah **explicitly writes** the durations of **their impurity**. **This**, one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, has **impurity of seven days written in his regard**; and similarly, **that**, one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman, has **impurity of seven days written in his regard**. There is no need for the *baraita* to derive a matter explicitly written in the Torah from another matter explicitly written in the Torah.

Perek I  
Daf 6 Amud b

NOTES

Actually, the *baraita* is referring to the duration of their impurity – **לְעוֹלָם לְטוֹמְאָתָן**: The Gemara in tractate *Pesahim* suggests an additional novelty: The two cases are similar with regard to their banishment from the camp and the places that they may not enter (Rosh; Tosafot).

אֵלָּא לָאוּ – לְטַבִּילָתָן?

**Rather**, must it **not** be that the *baraita* is equating them with regard to **their immersion**, in that both one who has relations with a menstruating woman and one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse immerse during the day?

לֹא, לְעוֹלָם לְטוֹמְאָתָן, סִיפָא אֶצְטְרִיכָא לֵיהּ: אֵלָּא שְׁחִמּוּר מִמֶּנּוּ בּוֹעֵל נֶדֶה שְׂמִטְמָא מִשְׁכָּב וּמוֹשָׁב בְּטוֹמְאָה קְלָה, לְטִמְאָה אוֹכְלִין וּמִשְׁקִין.

The Gemara rejects that conclusion. **No**; **actually**, the *baraita* is referring to the duration of **their impurity**.<sup>N</sup> Although there is nothing novel in that equation, it was **necessary for the tanna** to teach the **latter clause** of the *baraita*: **However**, in one sense, the case of one who is impure because he **had relations with a menstruating woman** is **more severe than** one impure with impurity imparted by a corpse. One who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman **transmits impurity through lying on a bed or sitting on a chair**, even if he never came into direct contact with the chair or the bed. He renders the bed or chair impure **with a mild form of impurity**. He confers upon them first-degree ritual impurity status, sufficient only to **render foods and liquids impure**. One impure with impurity imparted by a corpse transmits impurity by means of direct contact.

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּתַנִּי רַבִּי חֵיְיָא: הַזָּב וְהַזָּבָה וְהַמְצוֹרֵעַ וְהַמְצוֹרֵעֶת וּבּוֹעֵל נֶדֶה וְטִמְאָה מֵת – טַבִּילָתָן בַּיּוֹם, נֶדֶה וְיוֹלְדֵת – טַבִּילָתָן בַּלַּיְלָהּ! תִּיּוּבְתָא.

**Come and hear** an additional proof that Rabbi Hiyya taught: For the *zav* and the *zava* and the leper and the female leper, and one who had relations with a menstruating woman, and one who is ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, **their immersion is during the day**. For a menstruating woman and a woman after childbirth, **their immersion is at night**. The Gemara concludes that this *baraita* is indeed a **conclusive refutation** of the opinion of Rav Shimi from Neharde'a, who said that one who is impure because he had relations with a menstruating woman immerses at night.

**Before you remove him** – עַד שְׂאֵתָהּ מִפְּרִישׁוֹ – Many early and later commentaries wondered about this question. The Gemara should not have asked why he is separated from his wife, but rather why he should not also be separated from impurity imparted by a corpse. Some explain that the Gemara is in fact asking: Why suggest that the separation is due to concern with regard to impurity from his wife, when it could have been explained that the separation is due to concern with regard to impurity imparted by a corpse (*Tosefot Ri HaLavan*)? This question is especially difficult because if the High Priest is sequestered due to concern that someone might die in his presence, all the more so would it be necessary to separate him from his wife (Rav Shmuel Strashun).

**Remove him from the potential of more severe impurity imparted by a corpse** – הִפְרִישֵׁהוּ מִטּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת – Rashi explains that the concern is that a visitor might die in the High Priest's chamber. Many commentaries question this explanation because that scenario is extremely unlikely, and because it is clear that the *tanna* is not concerned about potential death since he holds that a replacement wife need not be appointed lest the first wife die. Others counter that while it is unlikely that any single visitor might suddenly die, the High Priest will be receiving many guests in the course of the week, and that increases the likelihood that one will die (*Gevurat Ari*). Others explain that the concern is that a priest impure with impurity imparted by a corpse will render the High Priest impure through contact (Rav Yonatan of Lunel; *Tosafot Yeshanim*). Finally, the possibility that the High Priest might be exposed to impurity imparted by a corpse is less likely in the Temple than it is in his house (*Tosefot Ri HaLavan*).

**Impurity imparted by a corpse is permitted in cases involving the public** – טּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת הַיְהוּדָה הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר – In this case, a High Priest who became impure would proceed to perform the Yom Kippur service even though his replacement remains pure (*Peirush Kadmon*).

**Permitted and overridden** – הַיְהוּדָה וְדַחוּיָהּ – The difference between these two approaches extends beyond the immediate discussion of purity and impurity. The essence of the problem is this: When a specific prohibition is overridden in a particular case, does it mean that the status of the prohibition is as though it does not exist? Or is the prohibition merely not observed due to an unusual circumstance, in which case one must avoid violating the prohibition to whatever degree possible? Two cases where this question applies pertain to Shabbat: Offerings on Shabbat and saving a life on Shabbat. The question is whether all prohibitions are permitted, or whether one must ensure to whatever degree possible that he performs only those actions essential to sacrificing the offering or saving the life (see *Beit Yosef, Orah Hayyim* 328).

**The impure priests do not serve** – טַמְאֵי לֹא עֹבְדֵי – This would be so even if the impure priests were more prominent and worthy. They are not among those who enter the lottery to perform service that day (*Ritva*).

## PERSONALITIES

**Rav Tahlifa, father of Rav Huna bar Tahlifa** – רַב תַּחְלִיפָא אָבוּהּ – רַב הוּנָא בְּרַתְּ תַחְלִיפָא: This attribution of a father to his son is employed when the father is less prominent than his son and there are other Sages with the same first name. In order to identify Rav Tahlifa in this case, the Gemara refers to him by mentioning his well-known son.

וְעַד שְׂאֵתָהּ מִפְּרִישׁוֹ מִטּוּמְאַת בֵּיתוֹ, הִפְרִישֵׁהוּ מִטּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת! אָמַר רַב תַּחְלִיפָא אָבוּהּ דְּרַב הוּנָא (בְּרַתְּ תַחְלִיפָא) מִשְׁמִיחָ דְּרַבָּא: זֹאת אוֹמֶרֶת "טּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת הַיְהוּדָה הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר".

רַבִּינָא אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ תִימָא "טּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת דַּחוּיָהּ הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר" – טּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת לֹא שְׂכִיחָא, טּוּמְאַת בֵּיתוֹ שְׂכִיחָא.

אֵיתִמַר, טּוּמְאַת הַמֵּת, רַב נַחְמָן אָמַר: הַיְהוּדָה הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר, וְרַב שְׁשֶׁת אָמַר: דַּחוּיָהּ הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר.

הֵיכָא דְאֵיכָא טַמְאֵי וְטְהוּרִין בְּהַהוּא בֵּית אָב – כּוּלֵי עֲלֵמָא לֹא פְּלִיגֵי דְטְהוּרִין עֲבָדֵי, טַמְאֵי לֹא עֲבָדֵי. כִּי פְּלִיגֵי – לֹא הִדְרִי וְלֹא תוּי טְהוּרִין מִבֵּית אָב אַחֲרֵינָא.

רַב נַחְמָן אָמַר: הֵיטֵר הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר, וְלֹא מִהֲדְרִינָא. וְרַב שְׁשֶׁת אָמַר: דַּחוּיָהּ הִיא בְּצִיבּוֹר, וּמִהֲדְרִינָא.

אֵיכָא דְאָמְרֵי: אֲפִילוּ הֵיכָא דְאֵיכָא טְהוּרִין וְטַמְאֵי בְּהַהוּא בֵּית אָב פְּלִיגֵי רַב נַחְמָן וְאָמַר, עֲבָדֵי נִמְי טַמְאֵי,

With regard to the sequestering of the High Priest, the Gemara asks: **And before you remove him<sup>N</sup> from the potential of impurity of his house, remove him from the potential of the more severe impurity imparted by a corpse.**<sup>N</sup> The Sages should have instituted an ordinance prohibiting visitors to the High Priest lest one die while in his chamber and render him impure. **Rav Tahlifa, father of Rav Huna bar Tahlifa,<sup>P</sup> said in the name of Rava: That is to say that impurity imparted by a corpse is permitted in cases involving the public.**<sup>N</sup> In cases where the public is involved, impurity imparted by a corpse does not prevent the Temple service from being conducted. Since the service of the High Priest on Yom Kippur is a service involving communal offerings, impurity imparted by a corpse does not invalidate the service.

Ravina said: **Even if you say that impurity imparted by a corpse is merely overridden<sup>N</sup> in public and not completely permitted,** the idea that the High Priest is not removed from the potential of impurity imparted by a corpse can be understood. **Impurity imparted by a corpse is uncommon.** The likelihood that one visiting the High Priest will suddenly die is minimal. In contrast, **impurity of his house is common,** as uncertainty with regard to his wife's status as a menstruating woman could arise at any moment.

There is an amoraic dispute with regard to the effect of impurity imparted by a corpse on the conduct of the Temple service. **It was stated with regard to impurity imparted by a corpse that Rav Nahman said: It is permitted in cases involving the public;** e.g., when a majority of the Jewish people is impure, the service of a ritually pure priest is not preferable to that of an impure priest. The Temple service proceeds as though there was no impurity at all. **And Rav Sheshet said: Impurity imparted by a corpse is merely overridden in cases involving the public,<sup>N</sup> and service performed by a ritually pure priest is preferable.**

The Gemara restricts the scope of the dispute. In a case **where there are both ritually impure and pure priests in that patrilineal family** tasked with serving in the Temple on that day, **everyone,** even Rav Nahman, **agrees that the pure priests serve and the impure priests do not serve.<sup>N</sup> When they disagree,** it is with regard to a case where the entire patrilineal family is impure. Is it necessary to **seek out and bring pure priests from a different patrilineal family** belonging to the same priestly watch, who are tasked with serving in the Temple on a different day that week?

Rav Nahman said: The prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of impurity imparted by a corpse **is permitted** in cases involving the public, and we do not need to seek out other priests. Since the Torah permitted the performance of the Temple service by priests impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, it is completely permitted and it is as though the service is performed in purity. **Rav Sheshet said:** The prohibition of impurity imparted by a corpse **is overridden** in cases involving the public, and wherever possible we seek out ritually pure priests.

Some say that the dispute is slightly different: **Even in a case where there are both ritually pure and ritually impure priests in that patrilineal family, Rav Nahman disagreed with Rav Sheshet and said that the priests serve even when they are impure,**

## HALAKHA

Impurity imparted by a corpse is merely overridden in cases involving the public – טּוּמְאַת דַּחוּיָהּ בְּצִיבּוֹר – Even though communal offerings are offered by impure priests, this does not mean that the impurity is permitted, but rather that it is overridden in exigent circumstances. Therefore, if there are impure and pure priests in the same patrilineal family, one seeks out the pure priests even if they are in the minority, and even

brings them from other patrilineal families. The Rambam rules in accordance with the opinion of Rav Sheshet, following the principle that the *halakha* is ruled in accordance with his opinion in ritual matters. Apparently, other *amora'im* maintain that impurity imparted by a corpse is overridden in cases involving the public, as does the *tanna*, Rabbi Yosei (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 4:14–16 and *Kesef Mishne* there).