

מה להלן על ידי ניתוח ולא על ידי הפשט – אף כאן על ידי ניתוח ולא על ידי הפשט.

והתם מנא לן? דתניא: "וקרבו ופרשו והוציא" – מלמד שמוציאו שלם. וכול ישראל שרפו שלם – נאמר כאן "ראשו וקרעיו", ונאמר להלן (ראש וקרעים), מה להלן – על ידי ניתוח, אף כאן – על ידי ניתוח.

אי מה להלן על ידי הפשט – אף כאן על ידי הפשט? תלמוד לומר: וקרבו ופרשו. מאי תלמודא? אמר רב פפא: כשם שפרשו בקרבו – כך בשרו בעורו.

"מאימתי מטמאין בגדים". תנו רבנן: "ווציא אל מחוץ למחנה ושרפו".

להלן אתה נותן להם שלש מחנות, וקרא אתה נותן להם מחנה אחת, אם כן למה נאמר "מחוץ למחנה"? לומר לך: כיון שניצא חוץ למחנה אחת – מטמאים בגדים.

והתם מנא לן? דתניא: "והוציא את כל הפר" – חוץ לשלש מחנות.

Just as below it is prepared for burning by means of dissection and not by means of skinning, so too here it is by means of dissection and not by means of skinning.

The Gemara asks: **And there**, with regard to bull sin-offerings that are burned,<sup>n</sup> **from where do we derive** that they are cut but not skinned? The Gemara answers: **As it was taught** in a *baraita*: "And the skin of the bull and all its flesh, with its head and with its legs, and its innards, and its dung, even the whole bull shall he carry outside the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn it on wood with fire" (Leviticus 4:11–12). This teaches that he brings it out whole. One might have thought that he should burn it whole. It is stated here: **Its head and its legs, and it is stated there**, with regard to burnt-offerings, **head and legs. Just as there**, the burnt-offering is performed by means of dissection, as explicitly stated in the verse, **so too here it is by means of dissection.**

The Gemara asks: **If so**, derive the following from the same verbal analogy: **Just as there**, in the case of burnt-offerings, the dissection is performed with skinning, **so too here it is with skinning**, and he must remove the skin of the animals before burning them. The Gemara answers: Therefore, **the verse states "and its innards, and its dung."** The Gemara asks: **What is the derivation** from this phrase? **Rav Pappa said: Just as its dung is within its innards** and they do not remove it, **so too, its flesh is in its skin** and they do not separate the skin from the flesh.

It was taught in the mishna that the *tanna'im* disagree about the question of **at what point the bull and goat render the garments** of those who carried them **impure. The Sages taught a baraita** based on the verse: "The bull of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering whose blood was brought in to gain atonement in the sacred place, shall be taken outside the camp and they shall burn" (Leviticus 16:27).

One might wonder: **Below**, with regard to other bull sin-offerings that are burned, **you give them three camps**,<sup>n</sup> meaning that the bulls are burned outside the Israelite camp or, in the time of the Temple, outside Jerusalem. **And here you give them only one camp**, as they are burned as soon as they are taken out of the Temple courtyard, which is considered the camp of the Divine Presence. This seems unreasonable and is not to be accepted. **If so, why is it stated: "Outside the camp"?** The intention is not that they leave only one camp, but rather, **to say to you: Once it has left one camp it immediately renders the garments** of those carrying it **impure.**

The Gemara asks: **And there**, with regard to other bull sin-offerings that are burned, **from where do we derive** that they are removed from all three camps? The Gemara explains: **As it was taught** in a *baraita*: It is stated about the bull sin-offering of the High Priest: "Even the whole bull shall he carry outside the camp...and burn it" (Leviticus 4:12), meaning that he should take it **outside of three camps.**

NOTES

**Bulls that are burned** – פרים הנשרפים: There are two kinds of sin-offerings, outer sin-offerings and inner sin-offerings. Outer sin-offerings are brought by an individual who unwittingly violates a prohibition that carries a punishment of *karet* for those who violate it purposefully. This offering may be either a lamb or a goat; however, if a king brings the offering, it must be a goat. The blood of the offering is sprinkled on the corners of the outer altar, and its fats and sacrificial portions are burned on the altar. The remainder of the flesh is eaten by male priests. Inner sin-offerings are brought by the community or the High

Priest for following a mistaken halakhic ruling. These offerings are bulls, and their blood is sprinkled toward the curtain and on the golden altar. Their organs are burned on the altar, but their flesh, hides, and innards are burned outside the camp. The bull and goat of Yom Kippur fall into this second category, and therefore the *halakhot* of inner sin-offerings apply to them.

**Three camps** – שלש מחנות: When the Jewish people were in the wilderness, the camp was arranged around the Tabernacle

and was divided into three areas. The first camp was that of the Divine Presence, which included the Tabernacle and its courtyard. The second camp was the Levite camp, whose tents surrounded the Tabernacle. Surrounding this was the Israelite camp, where the rest of the nation pitched its tents. When the Temple was built in Jerusalem, a similar arrangement was instituted. The Temple and its courtyard comprised the camp of the Divine Presence, the Temple Mount was the Levite camp, and the city of Jerusalem was the Israelite camp.

NOTES

It is stated here, outside the camp, etc. – נֹאמַר כָּאן – *Tosafot* discuss the various derivations proposed in this passage, some of which contradict a principle stated in tractate *Zevahim* that a *halakha* derived from a juxtaposition cannot then serve as a source from which a *halakha* may be derived through another juxtaposition. Apparently, the derivations must be understood as based upon a verbal analogy, in which the *halakha* in one case is derived based upon a juxtaposition. Even according to the opinion that this form of derivation is not acceptable in the realm of sacrificial law, perhaps the Gemara here follows the opinion that the red heifer is not really an offering and therefore not subject to this principle (Ritva).

HALAKHA

The place where the sin-offerings are burned – מקום – שְׂרִיפַת חֲטָאוֹת הַנִּשְׂרָפוֹת: Bulls and goats of inner sin-offerings are burned together with their hides and dung outside Jerusalem in a location known as the place of the ashes (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 7:2).

אֵתָּה אֹמֵר חוּץ לְשָׁלֹשׁ מַחֲנֵה, אוֹ אֵינִי אֶלָּא חוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה אֶחָת? בְּשֵׁהוּא אֹמֵר בְּפֶר הַעֲדָה: "אֶל מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה", שְׂאִין תִּלְמוּד לֹאמֹר, שֶׁהָיָה כְּבֹר נֹאמֵר: "וְשָׂרַף אֹתוֹ בְּאֶשֶׁר שָׂרַף אֶת הַפָּר הָרֵאשׁוֹן" וְמָה תִּלְמוּד לֹאמֵר: "אֶל מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה" – לִיתֵן לוֹ מַחֲנֵה שְׁנִיָּה.

וְכִשְׁהוּא אֹמֵר "מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה" בְּדָשׁוֹן, שְׂאִין תִּלְמוּד לֹאמֹר, שֶׁהָיָה כְּבֹר נֹאמֵר: "אֶל שְׂפָךְ הַדָּשׁוֹן" – תֵּן לוֹ מַחֲנֵה שְׁלִישִׁית.

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן הָיָה "מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה" מֵאֵי עֲבִיד לִיָּהּ? מִיָּבֵעֵי לִיָּהּ לְכַדְתֵּינָא. רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אֹמֵר: נֹאמֵר כָּאן "מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה" וְנֹאמֵר לְהֵלֵן "מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֵה", מַה כָּאן – חוּץ לְשָׁלֹשׁ מַחֲנֵה, אֵף לְהֵלֵן – חוּץ לְשָׁלֹשׁ מַחֲנֵה. וְמָה לְהֵלֵן בְּמִזְרָחָה שֶׁל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם – אֵף כָּאן בְּמִזְרָחָה שֶׁל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם.

וְרַבְנָן, הֵיכָא שְׂרִיף לְהוּ? כְּדִתְנִינָא: הֵיכָן נִשְׂרָפוּיָן?

Do you say that he takes it **outside of three camps**, or is he required to take it **outside of only one camp**? When it says with regard to **the bull sin-offering** brought for the sin of the **community**: "He shall carry the bull **outside the camp**" (Leviticus 4:21), that verse requires explanation, as there is **no need for the verse to state this, since it was already stated**: "And burn it as he **burned the first bull**" (Leviticus 4:21), which indicates that all the *halakhot* of the bull sin-offering of a High Priest apply to the bull sin-offering of the community as well. **And what is the meaning when the verse states outside the camp? To give it a second camp**, i.e., to indicate that it must be removed from the Levite camp in addition to the camp of the Divine Presence.

**And when it says: "Outside the camp"** (Leviticus 6:4) with regard to removal of the ash, that verse also requires explanation, as there is **no need for the verse to state this, since it was already stated** with regard to the bull sin-offering of a High Priest: "Even the whole bull shall he carry outside the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn it on wood with fire; **where the ashes are poured out shall it be burned**" (Leviticus 4:12). Rather the repetition of the words: Outside the camp, indicates that he should **give it a third camp**, so that it is burned outside of the Israelite camp as well. Consequently, it has been derived that inner sin-offerings are burned outside of the three camps, and when the Torah states: Outside the camp, with regard to the bull and goat of Yom Kippur, it teaches that as soon as they are taken outside the Temple courtyard, the garments of those carrying them are rendered impure.

The Gemara asks: **And what does Rabbi Shimon do with the phrase outside the camp**, as he holds that those carrying the bull and goat are rendered impure only once they leave all three camps? The Gemara answers: **He needs it for that which was taught in a baraita**, that **Rabbi Eliezer says: It is stated here**, with regard to the bull of Yom Kippur, **outside the camp**,<sup>n</sup> **and it is stated there**, with regard to the red heifer, **"outside the camp"** (Numbers 19:3). **Just as here**, it is burned **outside three camps**, **so too there** the heifer, it is burned **outside three camps**. **And just as there** it is burned **east of Jerusalem**, since the heifer must be burned "toward the front of the Tent of Meeting" (Numbers 19:4), opposite the entrance to the Temple to its east, **so too here** the bull and goat of Yom Kippur are burned **east of Jerusalem**.

The Gemara asks: **And according to the Rabbis, where do they burn them?**<sup>h</sup> The Gemara answers: **As it was taught in a baraita: Where are they burned?**

Perek VI  
Daf 68 Amud b

לְצִפּוֹנָה שֶׁל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, וְחוּץ לְשָׁלֹשׁ מַחֲנֵה. רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אֹמֵר: אֵבֵית הַדָּשָׁן נִשְׂרָפוּיָן.

אָמַר רַבָּא: מֵאֵן תִּנְא דְפִלְגֵי עֲלֵיהּ דְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי – רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב הוּא. דִּתְנִינָא: "אֶל שְׂפָךְ הַדָּשָׁן יִשְׂרָף" שְׂיֵהָא לְשָׁם דָּשָׁן. רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אֹמֵר: שְׂיֵהָא מְקוֹמוֹ מִשׁוֹפֵךְ.

North of Jerusalem, and outside of three camps. Rabbi Yosei says: **They are burned in the place of the ashes.**

Rava said: Who is the *tanna* who disagrees with Rabbi Yosei on this issue? It is Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, as it was taught in a *baraita* with regard to the verse: "Where the ashes are poured out [*shfekh hadeshen*] shall it be burned" (Leviticus 4:12), which means that there shall already be ash there in that place, so that it is known as the ash heap even before this animal is burned there. **Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says**: This verse indicates that its place should be slanted [*meshupakh*] so that ash that is deposited there will roll downhill. Rava understood that whereas Rabbi Yosei requires that there already be ash present when the bull is burned, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov does not.

They do not render garments impure once they become ash – לֹא מְשַׁנְעֵשׂוּ אֶפְרַיִם מְטַמְּאִין בְּגָדִים – One who burns the bull and goat of Yom Kippur is rendered impure, and his garments are also rendered impure. This is true of one who assists with the burning by moving the carcass, adding wood to the fire, or stoking the fire, and it applies even after the carcasses are charred, as long as they have not yet been turned to ash. However, once the carcasses have turned to ash, they no longer cause impurity. Furthermore, one who kindles the fire or arranges the pile of wood before the burning remains pure (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Para Aduma* 5:4).

How did they know that the goat reached the wilderness – מִיָּנִין הָיוּ יוֹדְעִין שֶׁהִגִּיעַ שְׁעִיר לַמִּדְבָּר – Platforms were constructed along the way to the wilderness, and flags were waved to transmit the news that the goat had reached the wilderness (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 3:7).

NOTES

The goat has reached the wilderness – הִגִּיעַ שְׁעִיר לַמִּדְבָּר – It is appropriate that the next part of the Yom Kippur service, the reading of the Torah, be performed after the main atonement of the day has been achieved through the scapegoat. The whitening of the ribbon is proof of that (see *Tosafot Yeshanim*; *HaBoneh*, Rabbi Yehuda Aryeh of Modena's commentary on *Ein Ya'akov*).

Didn't they already have a reliable indicator – וְהֲלֹא סִימָן – גְּדוּל הָיָה לָהֶם: Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda holds that there is no need to bother with messengers and flags in order to be certain that the goat had arrived. The first *tanna* holds that it is necessary to have concrete knowledge that the goat reached the wilderness, and therefore Rabbi Yehuda's calculation, which is based on projection rather than knowledge, and the miracle that Rabbi Yishmael relies upon, are insufficient.

Beit Hiddudo – בֵּית חִדּוּדוֹ: Beit Hiddudo was so called because the cliff was sharp [*meḥudad*] and had rocks protruding from it (*Tosafot Yom Tov*; *Meleket Shlomo*). An alternative version of the text reads Beit Haroro, which has been explained as a location formed by two connected mountains [*harim*].

LANGUAGE

Platforms [*dirkaot*] – דִּירְכָאוֹת: According to most versions of the text, the term here should be *didkhiot*. The origin of this word is the Greek διάδοχος, *diadokhos*, meaning a rear guard, or messengers who bring news from an army's front lines.

Scarves [*sudarin*] – סוּדָרִיָּן: From the Greek σουδάριον, *sudariyon*, in Latin, *sudarium*. The term means scarf or towel.

אמר ליה אביי: ודילמא במקומו משופך הוא דפליגי?

Abaye said to him: There is no proof from here, as perhaps they disagree only about whether the place must be slanted. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov may agree there should be ash there to begin with, but he adds that the place must also be slanted. Therefore, there is no proof to support Rava's statement.

תנו רבנן: 'והשורף' – השורף מטמא בגדים, ולא המצית את האור, ולא המסדר את המערכה, ואי זהו השורף – זה המסייע בשעת שריפה.

The Sages taught: It states: "And he who burns them shall wash his garments" (Leviticus 16:28), to indicate that only the garments of the one who burns the bull and goat of Yom Kippur are rendered impure, but not the garments of the one who kindles the fire, and not the garments of the one who arranges the pile of wood. And who is the one who burns? It is the one who assists at the actual time of burning.

יכול אף משנעשו אפר מטמאין בגדים – תלמוד לומר: 'אותם' – אותם מטמאין בגדים ולא משנעשו אפר מטמאין בגדים. רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון אומר: הפר מטמא, ניתך הבשר – אינו מטמא בגדים.

One might have thought that garments would be rendered impure even after the bull and goat have become ash. Therefore, the verse states: Them, to indicate that they themselves, the bull and goat of Yom Kippur, render garments impure, but they do not render garments impure once they become ash.<sup>h</sup> Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: The bull causes ritual impurity before it is burned, but once the flesh is burned it no longer renders garments impure.

מאי בינייהו? – איכא ביניהו דשויה חרובא.

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between the opinion of the first *tanna* and the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon? The Gemara answers: There is a difference between them when he turned it into a charred mass and the form of the animal has already become distorted but has not actually become ash. According to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, it no longer causes impurity.

**MISHNA** They said to the High Priest: The goat has reached the wilderness.<sup>n</sup> And how did they know in the Temple that the goat reached the wilderness?<sup>h</sup> They would build platforms [*dirkaot*]<sup>l</sup> all along the way and people would stand on them and wave scarves [*sudarin*]<sup>l</sup> to signal when the goat arrived. And therefore they knew that the goat reached the wilderness.

מתני' אמרו לו לכהן גדול: הגיע שער למדבר. ומניין היו יודעין שהגיע שער למדבר? דירכאות היו עושין, ומניפין בסודרין, ויודעין שהגיע שער למדבר.

Rabbi Yehuda said: Why did they need these platforms? Didn't they already have a reliable indicator?<sup>n</sup> From Jerusalem to Beit Hiddudo,<sup>n</sup> the edge of the wilderness, where the mitzva of dispatching the goat was performed, was a distance of three *mil*. Since the nobles of Jerusalem walked a *mil* to escort the dispatcher and returned a *mil*, and waited the time equivalent to the time it takes to walk a *mil*, they knew that the goat reached the wilderness. There was no need for the platforms.

אמר רבי יהודה: והלא סימן גדול היה להם: מירושלים ועד בית חדוד – שלשה מילין, הולכין מיל וחוזרין מיל ושזהין כדי מיל, ויודעין שהגיע שער למדבר.

Rabbi Yishmael says: Didn't they have a different indicator? There was a strip of crimson tied to the entrance to the Sanctuary, and when the goat reached the wilderness and the mitzva was fulfilled the strip would turn white, as it is stated: "Though your sins be as scarlet, they will become white as snow" (Isaiah 1:18).

רבי ישמעאל אומר: והלא סימן אחר היה להם, לשון של זהרית היה קשור על פתחו של היכל, וכשהגיע שער למדבר היה הלשון מלבין, שנאמר: "אם יהיו חטאיכם כשנים בשלג ילבינו".

**GEMARA** Abaye said: Learn from this that Beit Hiddudo is located in the wilderness, and this comes to teach us that Rabbi Yehuda holds that once the goat has reached the wilderness, its mitzva is complete even before it is pushed off the cliff, and there is no need to wait any longer.

גמ' אמר אביי: שמע מינה – בית חדוד במדבר קיימא, והא קא משמע לן, דקסבר רבי יהודה: כיון שהגיע שער למדבר – נעשית מצותו.

הדרן עלך שני שעירי

**מתני'** בִּא לֹוּ בְהֵן גְּדוּל לְקוֹרָת, אִם רָצָה לְקוֹרָת בְּבִגְדֵי בּוּץ – קוֹרָא, וְאִם לְאוֹ – קוֹרָא בְּאַצְטְלִית לְבָן מְשֻׁלוֹ.

חֵזַן הַכֹּהֵן נוֹטֵל סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה וְנוֹתְנוּ לְרֹאשׁ הַכֹּהֵן, וְרֹאשׁ הַכֹּהֵן נוֹתְנוּ לְסֵגָן, וְהַסֵּגָן נוֹתְנוּ לְכֹהֵן גְּדוּל, וְכֹהֵן גְּדוּל עוֹמֵד וּמִקְבֵּל וְקוֹרָא בְּאַחֲרֵי מוֹת"וֹ וְ"אֵךְ בְּעֵשׂוֹר", וְגוֹלֵל סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה וּמְנִיחוֹ בְּחִיקוֹ, וְאוֹמֵר: יוֹתֵר מִמָּה שֶׁקְּרָאתִי לְפָנֶיכֶם כְּתוּב כְּאֵן, "וּבְעֵשׂוֹר" שֶׁבְּחֻמְשַׁת הַפְּקוּדִים קוֹרָא עַל פִּיה.

וּמְבַרֵךְ עֲלֶיהָ שְׁמוֹנֶה בְּרָכוֹת: עַל הַתּוֹרָה, וְעַל הָעֲבוּדָה, וְעַל הַהוֹדָאָה, וְעַל מַחִילַת הָעוֹן, וְעַל הַמְּקַדֵּשׁ בְּפָנֶי עֲצֻמוֹ, וְעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּפָנֶי עֲצֻמוֹ, וְעַל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם בְּפָנֶי עֲצֻמָּה, וְעַל הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּפָנֶי עֲצֻמוֹ, וְעַל שְׂאֵר הַתְּפִלָּה.

הַרוֹאֶה בְהֵן גְּדוּל כְּשֶׁהוּא קוֹרָא – אֵינוֹ רוֹאֶה פֶּר וְשְׂעִיר הַנִּשְׂרָפִין, וְהַרוֹאֶה פֶּר וְשְׂעִיר הַנִּשְׂרָפִין – אֵינוֹ רוֹאֶה בְהֵן גְּדוּל כְּשֶׁהוּא קוֹרָא. וְלֹא מִפְּנֵי שְׂאֵינוֹ רֹשָׁאֵי, אֲלֵא שֶׁהִיְתָה דְרֹךְ רְחוֹקָה, וּמְלֵאכֶת שְׁנֵיהֶן שְׂוֶה בְּאַחַת.

**MISHNA** The High Priest came to read<sup>N</sup> the Torah. If he wished to read the Torah while still dressed in the fine linen garments,<sup>NH</sup> i.e., the priestly vestments he wore during the previous service, he may read wearing them; and if not he is permitted to read in a white robe of his own, which is not a priestly vestment.

The synagogue attendant takes a Torah scroll and gives it to the head of the synagogue<sup>B</sup> that stood on the Temple Mount; and the head of the synagogue gives it to the deputy High Priest, and the Deputy gives it to the High Priest, and the High Priest stands and receives the scroll from his hands. And he reads from the scroll the Torah portion beginning with the verse: "After the death" (Leviticus 16:1) and the portion beginning with the verse: "But on the tenth" (Leviticus 23:26), and furls the Torah scroll and places it on his bosom and says: More than what I have read before you is written here. The Torah portion beginning with the verse: "And on the tenth," from the book of Numbers (29:7),<sup>N</sup> he then reads by heart.<sup>H</sup>

And he recites after the reading the following eight blessings:<sup>HN</sup>  
Concerning the Torah: Who has given us the Torah of truth; and concerning the Temple service: Find favor in Your people Israel and accept the service in Your most holy House... for You alone do we serve with reverence;  
and concerning thanksgiving: We give thanks to You;  
and concerning pardon of iniquity: Pardon our iniquities on this Yom Kippur;  
and concerning the Temple in and of itself, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose the Temple;  
and concerning the Jewish People in and of itself, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose Israel;  
and concerning Jerusalem in and of itself, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose Jerusalem;  
and concerning the priests in and of themselves, which concludes: Blessed...Who chose the priests;  
and concerning the rest of the prayer, which concludes: Blessed...Who listens to prayer.

The Mishna comments: One who sees the High Priest<sup>N</sup> reading the Torah does not see the bull and goat that are burned; and one who sees the bull and goat that are burned does not see the High Priest reading the Torah. The Mishna explains: And this is not due to the fact that one is not permitted to see both, but because there was a distant path between them, and the performance of both of them is undertaken simultaneously.

#### BACKGROUND

Head of the synagogue – רֹאשׁ הַכֹּהֵן: In the period of the Mishna and the Talmud, the individual appointed over synagogue matters was called the head of the synagogue, or ἀρχισυναγωγος, *archisynagogos*, in Greek. The title *hazan* was used for the attendant of a synagogue, who often also lived there, especially if that synagogue was situated outside

the city limits. The synagogue adjacent to the Temple was located on the Temple Mount and was a designated place of prayer for those who came to the Temple to sacrifice offerings or to watch the sacrificial service. The officials of this synagogue held a certain importance and were considered second in rank to the deputy High Priest.

#### NOTES

The High Priest came to read – בִּא לֹוּ בְהֵן גְּדוּל לְקוֹרָת: The Jerusalem Talmud presents the verse: "And he did that which the Lord commanded Moses to do" (Leviticus 16:34) as the basis of the obligation to read the Torah as part of the day's service. It is insufficient to merely perform the day's service; the biblical passages describing it are also read.

Fine linen garments – בְּבִגְדֵי בּוּץ: The High Priest is permitted to wear the linen garments for the Torah reading only because he is already wearing them. He would not, however, be permitted to change into the golden garments; doing so would require immersion and sanctification beforehand, which must be followed immediately by performing a service. As the Gemara explains, the reading of the Torah is not considered a service in its own right (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

The book of Numbers – חֻמְשַׁת הַפְּקוּדִים: In Talmudic literature, the fourth book of the Torah is usually referred to as Numbers [*Pekudim*] due to the two censuses of the Jewish People recorded within. Sometimes it is also referred to by its first word: *Vayedabber*. The title *Bamidbar*, which is commonly used nowadays, was introduced only at a relatively late stage.

Eight blessings – שְׁמוֹנֶה בְּרָכוֹת: The mishna appears to actually list nine blessings. This discrepancy is due to the different versions that exist of the text of the mishna. In many versions, the blessing concerning Jerusalem is omitted, leaving eight blessings. Indeed, the blessing concerning Jerusalem is absent from the *baraita* cited by the Gemara, which also lists the blessing. Other texts of the mishna omit the phrase: In and of itself, following the blessing concerning the Jewish People and place it immediately before the blessing concerning the rest of the prayer. Accordingly the Jewish People and the rest of prayer are mentioned together in a single blessing, and as such there are only eight blessings (see *Melekheth Shlomo*).

One who sees the High Priest, etc. – הַרוֹאֶה בְהֵן גְּדוּל וכו': The principle behind this halakha is that it is permitted to neglect one mitzva in order to be involved in a different mitzva, in this case, to neglect the reading of the Torah in order to see the bull and goat that are burned. This is not considered a violation of the principle that one may not pass over an opportunity to fulfill a mitzva, since that principle applies only when one is already engaged with that mitzva and been committed to it (Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna; *Me'iri*). The novelty of the mishna's statement lies in the fact that the two events were performed simultaneously despite that had the two events been performed at different times, the crowds for each event would have been far greater, which would be a fulfillment of: "The king's glory is in the multitude of people" (Proverbs 14:28). Nevertheless, this reason was not compelling enough to alter the day's schedule (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

#### HALAKHA

If he wished to read in the fine linen garments – אִם רָצָה לְקוֹרָא בְּבִגְדֵי בּוּץ: This Torah reading is not a sacred Temple service. Therefore, the High Priest may decide if he wishes to recite the reading in his own mundane clothes or in the white priestly vestments (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 3:9).

Order of the reading – סֵדֵר הַקְּרִיאָה: The synagogue attendant at the Temple takes the Torah scroll and gives it to the head of the synagogue, who gives it to the deputy High Priest. The Deputy gives it to the High Priest, who stands and reads the Torah portion: "After the death," and then the portion: "But on the tenth." He furls the Torah and says: More than what I have read before you is written here, and then he recites by heart verses concerning Yom Kippur that are taken from the book of Numbers (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 3:10).

He recites... eight blessings – וּמְבַרֵךְ... שְׁמוֹנֶה בְּרָכוֹת: The High Priest recites blessings before and after the Torah reading as usual. After the regular blessing concerning the Torah he adds an additional seven blessings (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 3:11).

גמ' מִדְּקָתָנִי "בְּאַצְטְלִית לְבָן מִשְׁלוֹ" –  
מִכְּלָל דְּקָרִיָאָה לָאוּ עֲבוּדָה הִיא.

וְקָתָנִי: "אִם רָצָה לְקֹרֹת בְּבִגְדֵי בּוּץ –  
קֹרֵא". שְׁמַעְתָּ מִיָּנָה: בְּגִדֵי כְהוּנָה מִתְּנֶה  
לִיהֵנוֹת בְּהֵן! דִּילְמָא שְׂאֵינִי קָרִיָאָה,  
דְּצוּרְךָ עֲבוּדָה הִיא.

דְּאִיבְעִיָא לָן: בְּגִדֵי כְהוּנָה מִתְּנֶה לִיהֵנוֹת  
בְּהֵן, אוֹ לֹא מִתְּנֶה לִיהֵנוֹת בְּהֵן?

תָּא שְׁמַע: לֹא הִיוּ יֹשְׁנִים בְּבִגְדֵי קוֹדֶשׁ.  
שְׁיִנָּה הוּא דְלָא, הָא מִיכָל – אֲכָלִי.  
דִּילְמָא שְׂאֵינִי אֲכִילָה, דְּצוּרְךָ עֲבוּדָה  
הִיא, בְּדַתְנִיָא: "וְאָכְלוּ אוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר  
כּוֹפֵר בָּהֶם" מִלְּמַד שְׁהִכְהִינִם אוֹכְלִים  
וּבְעֵלִים מִתְּכַפְּרִין.

שְׁיִנָּה הוּא – דְלָא, הָא הִלּוּכִי – מְהִלְכִי!  
בְּדִין הוּא דְהִלּוּכִי נִמְי לָא.

**GEMARA** From the fact that it is taught in the  
mishna that the High Priest is permitted  
to read in a white robe of his own, one may derive by inference  
that the reading of the Torah is not classified as a service,  
which would have required that he wear priestly vestments.

But the mishna also teaches: If he wished to read the Torah  
while still dressed in the fine linen garments, he may read wear-  
ing them. This is true even though they are consecrated as priest-  
ly vestments and the reading of the Torah is not a sacred service.  
Therefore, the Gemara suggests: Learn from this that it is per-  
mitted to derive benefit from priestly vestments,<sup>N</sup> i.e., even  
when not engaged in performing a service, a priest may derive  
benefit from the priestly vestments, for example, by wearing  
them for his own needs. If so, this would settle a long-standing  
unresolved dilemma concerning this issue. The Gemara rejects  
this suggestion: A proof may not be adduced from here because  
perhaps reading from the Torah is different, since it is for the  
purpose of the service; therefore, even though it is not a true  
service in its own right, it is nevertheless permitted for the High  
Priest to continue wearing the priestly vestments.

As the dilemma was raised before us: Is it permitted to derive  
benefit from priestly vestments, or is it not permitted to  
derive benefit from priestly vestments?

Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma based on a mishna:  
The priests would not sleep in the sacred vestments out of  
concern they might pass wind while sleeping.<sup>H</sup> One may infer:  
It is specifically sleep which is not permitted, but they may eat  
while wearing the priestly vestments, even though eating is not  
a service. This should prove that it is permitted to derive per-  
sonal benefit from wearing priestly vestments. The Gemara re-  
jects this proof: A proof may not be adduced from here because  
perhaps eating is different, since it is for the purpose of the  
Temple service. As it was taught in a baraita that the verse  
states: "And they shall eat those things with which atonement  
was made" (Exodus 29:33), which teaches that the priests eat  
the meat of the offerings and the owners of those offerings  
thereby achieve atonement.

The Gemara suggests making a different inference from that  
mishna cited above: One may infer that it is specifically sleep  
which is not permitted, but they may walk while wearing the  
sacred vestments even when not engaged in a service. This  
should prove that it is permitted to derive benefit from wearing  
priestly vestments. The Gemara rejects this proof: It is incorrect  
to make this inference since by right the mishna should have  
stated that walking in priestly vestments is also not permitted.

#### NOTES

To derive benefit from priestly vestments – בְּגִדֵי כְהוּנָה... –  
לִיהֵנוֹת בְּהֵן: If there were an absolute prohibition against deriv-  
ing any benefit from the priestly vestments, then upon comple-  
ting a service the priests would be required to immediately  
strip themselves of their garments so as not to transgress the  
prohibition. This is an unfair expectation; as the Gemara in

tractate *Kiddushin* states: The Torah was not given to the min-  
istering angels. It is therefore certainly permitted for the priests  
to continue wearing their priestly vestments upon comple-  
tion of a service. Since that is permitted, the Gemara consid-  
ers the possibility that the Torah did not prohibit deriving  
benefit at all.

#### HALAKHA

Sleeping in sacred vestments – שְׁיִנָּה בְּבִגְדֵי הַקּוֹדֶשׁ –  
The priests who spent the night in the Temple did not sleep in the priestly  
vestments; rather, they folded them and placed them next

to their heads. This ruling is in accordance with Rav Pappa's  
understanding cited later in the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*,  
*Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 8:6).