

NOTES

**Your choice vows** – מבחר נדרין: Certainly it is prohibited to sacrifice an animal with a blemish or another explicitly stated disqualification. Similarly, some animals, such as old or filthy animals, are considered inappropriate for use. The Gemara here teaches that even an animal that is otherwise fit to be used should be rejected if there is a superior specimen in the flock (see *Me'iri*).

ורבי – נפקא ליה מ"מבחר נדרין".  
ורבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון: חד בחובה  
וחד בנדבה, וצריכי.

And from where does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derive the requirement that the ram be of the best stock? He derives it from the verse: "Your choice vows" (Deuteronomy 12:11),<sup>N</sup> which teaches that all offerings must be from the choicest animals. And according to Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, why is this additional verse necessary? One verse refers to obligatory offerings, and the other one refers to free-will offerings. And both are necessary because the requirement in one case cannot be learned from the other. It is reasonable that a free-will offering must be from the choicest animal since it is a voluntary gift; and it is also reasonable that an obligatory offering should be the choicest, since an obligation must be fulfilled in the finest possible way.

"קידש ידיו ורגליו". תנו רבנן:  
"ובא אהרן אל אהל מועד", למה  
הוא בא – להוציא את הכף ואת  
המחבתה.

§ It was taught in the mishna: The High Priest sanctified his hands and feet and entered the Holy of Holies to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan. The Gemara cites a related *baraita*. The Sages taught: The verse states: "And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting" (Leviticus 16:23), which is taken to mean that he enters the Holy of Holies. Why does he come? He comes in order to take out the incense spoon and the coal pan

Perek VII  
Daf 71 Amud a

NOTES

The whole portion is written in order – שכל הפרשה כולה – שכל הפרשה כולה: If indeed the High Priest reenters the Holy of Holies only later, why does the Torah mention his entry at this point, out of sequence? The Vilna Gaon explains that according to the *Sifra*, Aaron, the first High Priest, was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies throughout the year provided he observed the order of the service described in Leviticus, chapter 16. When the order of the verses is followed, it emerges that Aaron was able to enter the Holy of Holies with just three immersions. This was true throughout the year. However, on Yom Kippur itself, in order to achieve the requisite number of five immersions, the reentry had to be delayed, as described by the Gemara (*Hokhmat Adam*).

שכל הפרשה כולה נאמרה על  
הסדר, חוץ מפסוק זה.

as the whole portion of the service of the day detailed in Leviticus is written in this order,<sup>N</sup> and the service must be performed in that order, except for this verse, which is stated out of order and is performed only later. The verse detailing his reentry (Leviticus 16:23) is written before the verse detailing the sacrifice of the rams (Leviticus 16:24), but in fact the reentry occurs only after the sacrifice of the rams.

HALAKHA

Five immersions and ten sanctifications – חמש טבילות: The oral tradition teaches that on Yom Kippur the High Priest performs five immersions and sanctifies his hands and feet ten times. The mishna details their order and position within the service (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 2:2).

מאי טעמא? אמר רב חסדא: גמורי  
חמש טבילות ועשרה קידושין טובל  
בהן גדול ומקדש בו ביום.

The Gemara asks: What is the reason to assume this verse is written out of order? Rav Hisda said: They learned as a tradition that the High Priest performs five immersions and ten sanctifications<sup>H</sup> of his hands and feet when he changes clothing on that day. Each time the High Priest changes between the white and golden garments, he sanctifies his hands and feet, immerses, dresses in the new set of garments and then once again sanctifies his hands and feet.

ואי אמרת בסדרן בתיבי – לא  
משכחת לה אלא שלש טבילות  
וששה קידושין.

And if you say that the verses, including this one, are written in order, you find only three immersions and six sanctifications. Read in order, the verses indicate only three changes of garments, which involve three immersions and six sanctifications. In order to arrive at the requisite numbers of five immersions and ten sanctifications one must assume that the High Priest's reentry into the Holy of Holies takes place at a later time, after he has already changed into the golden garments. This would require him to change into the white garments and then back into the golden garments, providing an additional two immersions and four sanctifications.

מתקיף לה רבי זירא: ודילמא מפסיק  
ליה בשעיר הנעשה בחוץ!

Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this: But perhaps the order of the verses in Leviticus can be maintained, and the requisite number of immersions and sanctifications still achieved, if he interrupts the service performed in the white garments with the goat whose services are performed outside of the Sanctuary, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, and are performed in the golden garments. The sacrifice of the goat is not mentioned in Leviticus but only in Numbers. Therefore, it could be inserted into the service of the day without compromising the order of the verses in Leviticus. The change into the golden garments and then back into the white garments would contribute an additional two immersions and four sanctifications, thus arriving at the requisite numbers.

וַיִּשָׁט אֶת בְּגָדָיו – וַיִּשָׁט אֶת בְּגָדָיו: The Gemara previously derived from this verse the obligation of the High Priest to sanctify his hands and feet when dressing and undressing. How, then, can the Gemara here derive something additional from this verse? Some explain that the first derivation was based on the juxtaposition of this verse to the next: “And he shall remove... and put on,” whereas this derivation is based on the superfluous phrase within the verse (*Tosafot Yeshanim*; Ritva).

אָמַר אַבְיָי אָמַר קָרָא, וַיִּצְאָ וְעָשָׂה אֶת עוֹלֹתָו מִיִּצְיָאָה רִאשׁוֹנָה עֲבִיד אֵילֹו וְאֵילֵי הָעָם.

Abaye said: It is clear that the verse detailing the reentry must be out of order, since **the verse states: “And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people”** (Leviticus 16:24). This is the first exit stated in the verses and implies that immediately **following his first exit from the Holy of Holies, he performs the sacrifice of his ram and the ram of the people** without any other interruption. If so, the reentry must occur only afterward.

רַבָּא אָמַר אָמַר קָרָא, וַיִּפְשֹׁט אֶת בְּגָדָיו הַבְּדָן שְׂאִין תְּלִמוּד לֹוּמַר “אֲשֹׁר לְבַשׁ, בְּלוּם אָדָם פּוֹשֵׁט אֶלָּא מַה שְּׁלֹוֹיבִשׁ? אֶלָּא מַה תְּלִמוּד לֹוּמַר “אֲשֹׁר לְבַשׁ” – שְׁלֵבִשׁ בְּבָר.

Rava said a different proof. **The verse states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments<sup>N</sup> which he wore when he went into the Sanctuary”** (Leviticus 16:23). Now, **the verse does not need to state “which he wore,”** as this is obvious; **can one remove anything other than what he is wearing? Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states “which he wore”?** It is referring to **those garments which he had already worn** previously, removed, and then worn again. It is therefore apparent that this verse occurs at a point when he had already changed out of the white garments and into the golden garments. Perforce, then, it must be out of order.

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּה בַּר רַב שִׁילָא: וְאִמָּא דְּמַפְסִיק לִיהָ בְּשַׁעֲרֵי הַנְּעֻשָׁה בְּחוּץ! הִכְתִּיב “וַיִּצְאָ וְעָשָׂה”.

Rabba bar Rav Sheila strongly objects to this: Say that the order of the verses can be maintained, and the requisite number of immersions and sanctifications achieved, if **he interrupts** the services performed in the white garments **with the goat** whose services are performed outside and are performed in the golden garments. This would provide the additional two immersions and four sanctifications required. The Gemara answers: **Isn’t it written: “And he shall exit and make his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people”** (Leviticus 16:24), which implies that immediately following his first exit he performs the sacrifice of his ram and the ram of the people and the reentry to the Holy of Holies occurs only later.

וְכָל הַפְּרָשָׁה בּוֹלָה נְאֻמָּרָה עַל הַפְּדֵרָה? וְהָא קָרָאֵי כְּתִיבֵי: “וְאֵת חֵלֶב הַחֲטָאֹת וְקִטְיֵיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ”, וְהָדֵר: “וְאֵת פֵּר הַחֲטָאֹת וְאֵת שְׁעִיר הַחֲטָאֹת”. וְאֵילֹו אֲנִן תִּנְן: הַרְוָאָה אֶת בְּהֵן גְּדוֹל בְּשָׂהוּא קוֹרָא אֵינֹו רֹוּאָה פֵּר וְשַׁעֲרֵי הַנְּשַׁרְפִּין, וְאֵילֹו אִמּוּרֵי חֲטָאֹת בְּתֵר הָכִי מִקְטִיר לָהּ!

The Gemara questions the premise of the *baraita*: **Is the entire passage really written in order? But among the verses it is written: “And he shall burn the fat of the sin-offering upon the altar”** (Leviticus 16:25), **and then** in a later verse it is written: **“And the bull of the sin-offering, and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought to make atonement in the Sanctuary, shall be carried outside the camp; and they shall burn...”** (Leviticus 16:27). **Yet we learned in the mishna: One who sees the High Priest reading the Torah does not see the bull and goat that are burned, which are referred to in verse 27, while according to all opinions concerning the order of the day, the portions of the sin-offering to be consumed on the altar, which are mentioned in verse 25, are burned only afterward.** Therefore, it is apparent that these verses are also not in order.

אִימָא: חוּץ מִפְּסוּק זֶה וְאֵילָךְ.

The Gemara answers: Say that the intent of the *baraita* is that the verses are not in order **except for this verse and onward**.

וּמַאי חִוִּית דְּמִשְׁבָּשֵׁת קָרָאֵי? שְׁבִישׁ מִתְנִיתָא!

The Gemara asks: **And what did you see that you preferred to rearrange the order of the verses?** Instead, rearrange the order in the *mishna*.

אָמַר אַבְיָי, אָמַר קָרָא: “וְהַמְשַׁלַּח” וְהַשּׁוֹרֵף, מַה מְשַׁלַּח – דְּמַעֲיָקָרָא, אִף שׁוֹרֵף דְּמַעֲיָקָרָא.

Abaye said: It is clear that the verse detailing the burning of the remains of the bull is out of order, since **the verse states: “And the one who sends the goat to Azazel”** (Leviticus 16:26), and then states: **“And the one who burns them”** (Leviticus 16:28). The repeated use of the phrase “And the one who...” indicates that **just as the one who sends the goat to Azazel does so earlier, before the portions of the sin-offering are placed on the altar to be consumed, so too, the one who burns the remains of the bull and goat does so earlier, even though the verse detailing this burning is written after the verse detailing the burning of the portions of the sin-offering.**

אֲדַרְבָּה, מַה שׁוֹרֵף דְּהַשְׁתָּא, אִף מְשַׁלַּח דְּהַשְׁתָּא!

The Gemara rejects this: **On the contrary, one could make the opposite claim: Just as the one who burns the remains of the bull and goat does so now, so too, the one who sends the goat to Azazel does so only now, after the other sacrifices.**

וְהַמְשַׁלַּח – דְּמַעֲקָרָא מִשְׁמַע. רַבָּא אָמַר: אָמַר קָרָא "יַעֲמֹד חַי" עַד מְתֵי יְהִיא זְקוּן לְעַמּוּד חַי – עַד שְׁעַת כְּפָרָה, וְאִימְתֵי שְׁעַת כְּפָרָה – בְּשַׁעַת מוֹתֵן דְּמִים וְתוּ לָא.

אֲתֵי מְשַׁלַּח, מִצְאוּ בְּשׁוּק לְבֵהֵן גְּדוּל, אֹמֵר לוֹ: אִישִׁי בֵּהֵן גְּדוּל! עֲשִׂינוּ שְׁלִיחוּתְךָ. מִצְאוּ בְּבֵיתוֹ, אֹמֵר לוֹ: מַחֲיָה חַיִּים, עֲשִׂינוּ שְׁלִיחוּתוֹ.

אָמַר רַבָּה: כִּי מִיפְטְרֵי רַבְּנָן מִהַדְרֵי בְּפֻמְבִּדִיתָא אָמְרֵי הָבִי: מַחֲיָה חַיִּים יִתֵּן לָךְ חַיִּים אַרְוָבִים וְטוֹבִים וּמְתוּקָנִין.

"אֶתְהַלֵּךְ לִפְנֵי ה' בְּאַרְצוֹת הַחַיִּים" – אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: זֶה מְקוֹם שְׁוֹקִים.

"כִּי אֹרֶךְ יָמִים וְשָׁנֹת חַיִּים וְשָׁלוֹם יוֹסִיפוּ לָךְ." וְכִי יֵשׁ שָׁנִים שֶׁל חַיִּים וְיֵשׁ שָׁנִים שֶׁאֵינָן שֶׁל חַיִּים? אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: אֵילוּ שְׁנֹתָיו שֶׁל אָדָם, הַמִּתְהַפְּכוֹת עָלָיו מִרָעָה לְטוֹבָה.

"אֲלֵיכֶם אִישִׁים אֶקְרָא" אָמַר רַבִּי בְּרֵכְיָה: אֵילוּ תַלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים, שְׂדוּמִין לְנָשִׁים וְעוֹשֵׂי גְבוּרָה כְּאִנְשִׁים. וְאָמַר רַבִּי בְּרֵכְיָה: הַרְוֵצָה לְנֶסֶךְ יֵין עַל גְּבִי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ – יִמְלֵא גְרוֹנָם שֶׁל תַּלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים יֵין, שְׁנֵאָמַר "אֲלֵיכֶם אִישִׁים אֶקְרָא".

וְאָמַר רַבִּי בְּרֵכְיָה: אִם רֹאֵה אָדָם שְׂתוּרָה פּוֹסְקָת מִזֶּרְעוֹ – יִשָּׂא בֵּת תַּלְמִיד חָכָם, שְׁנֵאָמַר: "אִם יִזְקִין בְּאַרְץ שְׂרָשׁוּ וּבְעֶפְרַיִם יָמוּת גֹּעוּר,

The Gemara explains a difficulty with this: The phrasing of: "And the one who sends" implies that it was performed earlier. Alternatively, Rava said: Sending the goat away definitely took place earlier, as the verse states: "But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him" (Leviticus 16:10). This teaches: **How long must it stand alive?** It must do so until the moment of atonement. And when is the moment of atonement? It is at the moment of the presenting of the blood, but no later. At that point it is already sent away.

§ The Gemara describes the eventual meeting between the High Priest and the one who sends the goat to Azazel: When the one who sends the goat comes on the day following Yom Kippur, if he finds the High Priest in the market, which is a public place, he says to him: **My Master, High Priest, we performed your mission**, i.e., we fulfilled the mitzva of sending the goat to Azazel. He refers to the sending as the High Priest's mission as a public display of respect. But if he finds him in his house, he says to him: **The One Who grants life to the living, God, we performed His mission.**<sup>N</sup>

Apropos the phrase: The One Who grants life to the living, Rabba said: **When the Sages take leave from one another in Pumbedita, they say as follows: May the One Who grants life to the living grant you a long, good, and established life.**

Further apropos the phrase: The One Who grants life to the living, the Gemara explains a verse using a similar phrase and then additional verses. With regard to the verse: "I shall walk before the Lord in the lands of the living" (Psalms 116:9),<sup>N</sup> Rav Yehuda said: **This is the place of markets**, where food and needs can be readily obtained. King David, who wandered from place to place, prayed to always find ready sustenance.

The verse states: "For length of days, and years of life, and peace, will they add to you" (Proverbs 3:2). The Gemara asks: **Are there years of life and years that are not of life?** The Gemara explains: **Rabbi Elazar said:** "Years of life" refers to good years. As such, these additional years of life referred to in the verse are the **years of a person's life which are transformed for him from bad to good.**

The verse states: "To you men [ishim] do I call, and my voice is to the sons of men" (Proverbs 8:4). **Rabbi Berekhya said:** The word *ishim*, although it means men, is similar to the term *isha*, woman. It may therefore be taken to refer to these Torah scholars, who are similar to women<sup>N</sup> in that they are physically weak and are not engaged in many activities that other men are, but nevertheless, they act mightily like men when engaged in Torah study. **And Rabbi Berekhya said further about that same verse:** Nowadays one who wishes to pour libations of wine over the altar should fill the throats of Torah scholars with wine, as it is stated: "To you men [ishim] do I call." The use of the phrase *ishim*, which is similar to *isheh*, used for the altar's fire, suggests that scholars may be compared to the fire of the altar.

**And Rabbi Berekhya said:** If a person sees that Torah is ceasing<sup>N</sup> from his children, and they are not becoming Torah scholars like himself, he should marry the daughter of a Torah scholar. This will ensure that his children from her will be raised with Torah, as it is stated: "Though its root will grow old in the earth, and its trunk will die in the ground,

NOTES

The One Who grants life to the living, we performed His mission – מַחֲיָה חַיִּים עֲשִׂינוּ שְׁלִיחוּתוֹ: The commentaries discuss why this particular description of God was used in this context. The Maharsha suggests that the sender contrasts his own actions with those of God: We have fulfilled His mission to kill the living, i.e., killing the goat sent to Azazel, while God, in contrast, sustains the lives of the Jewish people so they do not die. Others note the midrash that states that the person who escorted the goat would die that same year. The sender therefore uses this

appellation of God as a prayer that God should grant him life in this world or the next (*Li Lishua*; Rav Shmuel Strashun; Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto). Rabbi Elyakim interprets the phrase entirely differently. He explains that the title: Who grants life to the living, refers to the High Priest, since his prayer gives life to the nation. However, since this can easily be misunderstood, it is inappropriate to utter such an expression in public.

In the lands of the living – בְּאַרְצוֹת הַחַיִּים: King David prayed to always walk before the Lord and avoid sin, even when walk-

ing in the marketplaces, which are places of temptation and distraction (*Me'iri*; Rav Ya'akov Emden).

Who are similar to women – שְׂדוּמִין לְנָשִׁים: Another explanation for the comparison is that like women, scholars stay at home and go out to the streets only infrequently (*Me'iri*).

Torah is ceasing – תּוֹרָה פּוֹסְקָת: The Gemara describes a situation where one's ancestors were great Torah scholars but his sons are not (*Petah Einayim*).

מריח מים יפריח ועשה קציר כמו נטע.

from the scent of water<sup>n</sup> it will blossom and put forth branches like a plant” (Job 14:8–9). If the figurative trunk of one’s family is drying up through lack of Torah, he should plant himself in a place of water, i.e., a family of scholars, water being a metaphor for Torah. This will ensure that his children will blossom into Torah scholars.

“יום טוב היה עושה לאוהביו. תנו רבנן: מעשה בכהן גדול אחד שיצא מבית המקדש, והוא אזלי בולי עלמא בתריה. בין דחזיונהו לשמעיה ואבטליון – שבקוהו לדידיה ואזלי בתר שמעיה ואבטליון.

It was taught in the mishna: The people escort the High Priest to his house. And he would make a feast for his loved ones. The Sages taught in a *baraita*: There was an incident involving one High Priest who exited the Holy Temple and everyone followed him. When they saw Shemaya and Avtalyon, the heads of the Sanhedrin, walking along, in deference to them they left the High Priest by himself and walked after Shemaya and Avtalyon.<sup>n</sup>

לסוף אתו שמעיה ואבטליון לאיפטורי מיניה דכהן גדול. אמר להן: ייתון בני עממין לשלם! אמרו ליה: ייתון בני עממין לשלם – דעבדין עובדא דאהרן, ולא ייתי בר אהרן לשלם – דלא עביד עובדא דאהרן.

Eventually, Shemaya and Avtalyon came to take leave of the High Priest before returning to their homes. Envious of the attention they received, he angrily said to them: Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace.<sup>n</sup> Shemaya and Avtalyon descended from converts, and he scornfully drew attention to that fact. They said to him: Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace, who perform the acts of Aaron, who loved and pursued peace; and let not a descendant of Aaron come in peace, who does not perform the acts of Aaron and who speaks condescendingly to descendants of converts.

מתני' כהן גדול משמש בשמונה כלים וההדיוט בארבעה: בכתונת, ומכנסים, ומצנפת, ואבנט. מוסיף עליו כהן גדול חשן ואפוד, ומעיל וציץ. באלו נשאלין באורים ותומים, ואין נשאלין אלא למלך, ולאב בית דין, ולמי שהציבור צריך בו.

**MISHNA** Throughout the year the High Priest serves in eight garments, and the common priest serves in four: In a tunic and trousers and a mitre<sup>n</sup> and a belt. The High Priest adds another four garments beyond those worn by the common priest: A breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a frontplate.<sup>h</sup> When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim*. And he may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim* only on behalf of the king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. Individual inquiries are not posed to the *Urim VeTummim*.<sup>h</sup>

גמ' תנו רבנן: דברים שנאמר בהן "שש" – חוטן כפול ששה, "משור" – שמונה, מעיל – שנים עשר, פרוכת – עשרים וארבעה. חוטן ואפוד – עשרים ושמונה.

**GEMARA** The Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to those items of the priestly vestments about which it is stated they must be made with linen [*shesh*], their threads are spun six-fold, as suggested by the use of the term *shesh*, which also means six. When the Torah states that certain items are twined,<sup>h</sup> it means their threads are spun eight-fold. Threads used to weave the robe were spun from twelve strands. The threads of the curtain were spun from twenty-four strands. The threads used to weave the breastplate and ephod were spun from twenty-eight strands.

חוטן כפול ששה מנא לן? דאמר קרא ויעשו את הכתנת שש ואת המצנפת שש ואת פארי המנבעת שש ואת מכנסי הברד שש משור. חמשה קראי בתויב: חד – לגופיה, דכיתנא גיהו. וחד – שיהא חוטן כפול ששה, וחד – שיהיו שורין, וחד – לשאר בגדים שלא נאמר בהן שש, וחד – לעכב.

The Gemara asks: That the threads made from *shesh* are spun six-fold, from where do we derive this? The verse states: “And they made the tunics of linen [*shesh*] of woven work for Aaron and for his sons. And the mitre of linen, and the adorning mitres of linen, and the linen [*bad*] trousers of twined linen” (Exodus 39:27–28). Five mentions of the word linen are written; four times as “*shesh*” and an additional instance of “*bad*,” both meaning linen. One mention is stated for that *halakha* itself, to teach that they should be made of linen. And one mention is written to teach that the threads should be spun six-fold, *shesh* being interpreted as six. And one mention teaches that the six strands should be spun together into one. And one mention teaches that this also applies to the other garments, even though the term *shesh* is not stated with regard to them. And one mention teaches that this requirement is indispensable and that garments not made this way are invalid.

NOTES

From the scent of water – מריח מים: The inference is made from the precise use of the phrase “from the scent of water.” Water is a metaphor for Torah. Therefore, the scent of water refers not to the Torah itself, but to something necessarily connected to it, namely the daughter of a Torah scholar (Rav Ya’akov Emden).

Walked after Shemaya and Avtalyon – אָזְלִי בְּתַר שְׁמַעְיָה – וְאַבְטַלְיֹן: The deference they showed to Shemaya and Avtalyon was in accordance with the *halakha* that the honor of a Torah scholar takes precedence even over the honor of a High Priest, unless the High Priest is himself a Torah scholar.

Let the descendants of the gentile nations come in peace – ייתון בני עממין לשלם: The Ritva notes that he did not explicitly mention that they were descendants of gentiles. The phrase descendants of the nations could also refer to the Jewish people, as used in the book of Judges: “After you, Benjamin, among your nations” (Judges 5:14). Still, his intentions were clear.

The common priest...and a mitre – ההדיוט...ומצנפת: In contrast to the mishna, the Torah uses different terms for the headgear of a common priest and a High Priest. That of a common priest is referred to as a *miba’at* (Exodus 28:40), and that of the High Priest is referred to as a *mitznetefet* (Exodus 28:4). Whether there was any distinction between the two is a matter of debate. According to some, both were made from identical scarves, sixteen cubits long, wrapped around the head, but they differed in the way they were wrapped. The common priest’s headpiece was wrapped to form a conic hat-like shape, whereas the High Priest’s was wrapped around the head like a bandage, similar to a turban (Rambam; Ramban; *Me’iri*).

Others suggest that the two mitres were totally distinct. They explain the High Priest’s mitre as above; however, they suggest that the common priest did not wear a scarf but a fully constructed hat (Ra’avad).

HALAKHA

Priestly garments – בגדי כהונה: A common priest serves in four garments: Tunic, trousers, mitre, and belt. These garments are made of white linen, except the belt, which is made of linen and wool, and their thread is six-fold. The High Priest wears the four garments of a common priest plus four additional garments: Robe, ephod, breastplate, and frontplate (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:1–2).

For whom is the *Urim VeTummim* consulted – למי נשאלין: The *Urim VeTummim* is consulted on behalf of a king, or on behalf of the president of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. It is not consulted for laypeople (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 10:12).

Items about which it is stated linen...twined – דברים “משור” שש: Every place in the Torah where it says linen, it means a six-fold thread, and where it says twined, it means an eight-fold thread (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:12).

*Bad* – בַּד: According to *Tosafot*, the Gemara relies on the assumption that unless otherwise stated, all garments mentioned in the Torah are made from either wool or linen. Therefore, it is sufficient to establish that one of the weaves mentioned refers to linen in order to confirm that all the others do as well.

מאי משמע דהאי שיש בִּיתְנָא הוא?  
אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: דְאָמַר קָרָא  
"בַּד" – דְּבַר הָעוֹלָה מִן הַקֶּקֶע בַּד  
בַּד. וְאִימָא עֵמְרָא! עֵמְרָא אִיפְצוּלִי  
מִפְצוּלָא. בִּיתְנָא נְמִי אִיפְצוּלִי מִפְצוּלִי!  
בִּיתְנָא אַגְבִּי לְקוֹתֵיהֶּ מִפְצוּלִי.

רבינא אמר מהכא: "פְּאָרֵי פְּשֵׁתִים  
יְהִיוּ עַל רֵאשׁוֹם וּמְכַנְסֵי פְּשֵׁתִים יְהִיוּ  
עַל מְתַנְיָהֶם."

אמר ליה רב אשי: הא מקמי דאתי  
יחזקאל מאן אמרה? ולטעמך, הא  
דאמר רב חסדא: דבר זה מתורת  
משה רבינו לא למדנו, מדברי יחזקאל  
בן בוזי למדנו: "כל בן נכר ערל לב  
וערל בשר לא יבא אל מקדשי" הא  
מקמי דאתי יחזקאל מאן אמרה?  
אלא: גמרא גמירי לה, ואתא יחזקאל  
ואסמכה אקרא. הכא נמי, גמרא  
גמירי לה, ואתא יחזקאל ואסמכה  
אקרא.

The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that this term *shesh* means linen? Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: As the verse also states: "*Bad*,"<sup>17</sup> and uses it interchangeably with *shesh*. And *bad* refers to something which sprouts from the ground stalk by stalk [*bad bad*], each one by itself. This is a fitting description of flax,<sup>18</sup> the plant used to produce linen, as opposed to other plants, such as cotton, whose fibers grow meshed together. The Gemara asks: And say that it refers to wool, since when it grows from the animal, each hair grows separately. The Gemara answers: Wool splits, with each hair dividing into several hairs, so it does not fully fit the description of sprouting stalk by stalk. The Gemara asks: But flax also splits into individual hairs. The Gemara answers: Flax, unlike wool, splits only when beaten.

Ravina said: We have a proof for the matter from here: The verse states: "They shall have linen [*pishtim*] mitres upon their heads, and linen trousers upon their loins" (Ezekiel 44:18). The term *pishtim* used in Ezekiel certainly refers to linen; therefore, it is clear that the terms *shesh* and *bad*, used in the Torah for the same garments, also refer to linen.

Rav Ashi said to him: But before Ezekiel came, who said this *halakha*? How was it known? Ravina retorted: And according to your reasoning, the same question could be asked with regard to that which Rav Hisda said concerning the disqualification of an uncircumcised priest from serving in the Temple: This matter we did not learn from the Torah of Moses our teacher, as it is not written explicitly in the Torah; rather, we learned it from the words of Ezekiel ben Buzi, as the verse states: "No foreigner, uncircumcised of heart or uncircumcised of flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary" (Ezekiel 44:9). One could ask here as well: Before Ezekiel came, who said this *halakha*? Rather, perforce, they learned it as a tradition and then Ezekiel came and supported it with a verse. Here, too, they learned it as a tradition and then Ezekiel came and supported it with a verse.

BACKGROUND



Flax flower



Dried flax



Traditional drying of flax



Flax fibers

**Flax – בִּיתְנָא:** Flax, or *Linum usitatissimum*, is an annual plant 30–100 cm tall with thin branches and sky-blue flowers. Oil can be extracted from the flax seeds and used for various purposes. Flax is among the ancient domesticated plants and its cultivation was widespread in ancient Egypt. Nowadays flax is grown mainly in areas with a mild climate. The plant's fibers, found in its stem, are used to prepare flax threads, or linen. The fibers are located mainly in the outer layer of the stalk and are composed mostly of cellulose. After the stems have been dried, the fibers are removed in a long process that includes soaking the stems until they are decomposed. The stems are then dried and beaten, after which special combs are employed to separate the fibers from the chaff.

“משור” – שמונה, מנא לן? דכתיב: “ויעשו על שולי המעיל רמוני תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני משור” וילין “משור” “משור” מפרוכת, מה להלן עשרים וארבעה – אף כאן עשרים וארבעה דהוה כל חד וחד תמני.

The Gemara continues to explain the *baraita*. That the use of the term **twined** implies that the thread should be spun from **eight** strands, **from where do we derive this? As it is written:** “**And they made upon the skirts of the robe pomegranates of sky-blue, and purple, and scarlet, twined**” (Exodus 39:24); and derive a verbal analogy from the term “twined” used in this verse and the term “twined” from the verse about the curtain: **Just as there**, with regard to the curtain, there are **twenty-four** strands, as will be explained, **so too here**, there are **twenty-four** strands in total. And since each pomegranate is made of three colors, sky-blue, purple, and scarlet, it must be **that each one of them** was spun from **eight** strands.

ויילף מהשון ואפוד, מה להלן עשרים ושמונה אף כאן עשרים ושמונה! דנין דבר שלא נאמר בו זהב מדבר שלא נאמר בו זהב, לאפוקי השון ואפוד שניאמר בהן זהב. אדרבה, דנין בגד מבגד, לאפוקי פרוכת, דאהל הוא!

The Gemara challenges this derivation: **Let us derive** the number of strands instead **from the breastplate and ephod** and say: **Just as there**, with regard to the breastplate and ephod, there are **twenty-eight** strands, **so too, here** there are **twenty-eight** strands. The Gemara answers: It is preferable to **derive** the *halakhot* of an item, i.e., the pomegranates, **with regard to which** the use of **gold threads is not stated**, from the *halakhot* of an item, i.e., the curtain, **with regard to which** the use of **gold threads is also not stated**. This would come to **exclude** the possibility of deriving them from the **breastplate and ephod, with regard to which** the use of **gold threads is stated**. The Gemara asks: **On the contrary**, it should be preferable to **derive** the *halakhot* of one **garment from another garment**, i.e., the *halakhot* of the robe from the *halakhot* of the breastplate and ephod. This would come to **exclude** the possibility of deriving them from the **curtain, which is a tent**, i.e., part of the Temple building, and not a garment. The Gemara accepts that the derivation is flawed.

אלא: דנין מאבנט, ודנין בגד ודבר שלא נאמר בו זהב, מבגד ודבר שלא נאמר בו זהב, ואין דנין דבר שאין בו זהב מדבר שיש בו זהב.

Rather, the need for thread of eight strands is **derived from the belt**, which had twenty-four threads in total, **and a garment and an item with regard to which** the use of **gold thread is not stated**, i.e., the pomegranates, **are derived from a garment and an item with regard to which** the use of **gold thread is not stated**. **And an item with no gold**, such as the pomegranates and robe, **is not derived from an item that has gold in it**, such as the breastplate and ephod.

רב מרי אמר: “תעשנו” כתיב, “תעשנו” – לזה ולא לאחר.

Rav Mari said another reason not to derive the number of strands in a pomegranate from the breastplate and ephod: “**Like the work of the ephod you shall make it**” (Exodus 28:15) **is written** with regard to the breastplate to indicate that **you shall make it**, i.e., the breastplate, like the ephod, which indicates that **for this**, i.e., the breastplate, you shall use thread of twenty-eight strands, **and not for anything else**.

רב אשי אמר: “ועשית” כתיב, שיהיו כל עשיות שוות, והיכי נעביד? נעביד תלתא דעשרה עשרה – הווי להו תלתין, נעביד תרי דתשעה תשעה וחד דעשרה – אמר קרא: “ועשית” שיהיו כל עשיותיו שוות.

Rav Ashi said another reason that there could not be twenty-eight strands in a pomegranate: “**And you shall make pomegranates of sky-blue, and of purple, and of scarlet**” (Exodus 28:33) **is written** to indicate **that all the makings of it must be equal**, i.e., that each color thread should be made from the same number of strands. However, if there are twenty-eight strands in total, the three threads, each of a different color, cannot be made with an equal number of strands, as **how should we do it? Let us make three colored threads of ten strands each; then they are thirty strands in total, which is too many. Let us make two colored threads of nine strands and one of ten; but the verse states: “And you shall make,”** to indicate that **all the makings of it must be equal**. Perforce, the threads used for the pomegranates and the robe must be derived from an item woven from threads of a number of strands divisible by three, such as the curtain.

מעיל שנים עשר מנא לן? דכתיב: “ועשית את מעיל האפוד”

The Gemara continues to explain the *baraita*: That the robe must be woven from threads spun from **twelve strands**,<sup>11</sup> **from where do we derive this? As it is written:** “**And you shall make the robe of the ephod**”

**HALAKHA**

The robe from twelve strands – מעיל שנים עשר – The High Priest’s robe was made entirely of sky-blue thread and its threads were twelve-fold (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:3).