The whole portion is written in order – The High Priest sanctified his hands and feet and entered 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 ( Hokhmaṭ Adam).

HALAKHA

Five immersions and ten sanctifications – 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).

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), 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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.
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 only occur afterward.

Rava said a different proof: The verse states: “And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting and he shall remove the linen garments” (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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

The Gemara rejects this: On the contrary, one could make the opposite claim: Just as the one who sends 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.
The Maharsha suggests that the sender contrasts his own action in supporting 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 Yehuda 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 – 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.

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), 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 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 ishel, 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 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 – 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 – 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.

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), 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 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 ishel, 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 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,
From the scent of water — דְּאַהֲרֹן

From the scent of water — קָצִיר

Perek VII
Dal 71 Amud b

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 mitre6 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.7 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 community of the court, or on behalf of one whom the community needs. Individual inquiries are not posed to the *Urim VeTummim*.9

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 [שֵׁשֶׁת], 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*,9 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.

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 [שֵׁשֶׁת] of woven work for Aaron and for his sons. And the mitre of linen, and the adorning mitre of linen, and the linen [בָּד] 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.
The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that this term shesh means linen? Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: As the verse also states: “Bad,” 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, 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.

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 Hisa 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 44:5). 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.

NOTES

Bad – רָד: 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.

BACKGROUND

Flax – פִּשְׁתִּים: 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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

The Gemara continues to explain the baraita: That the robe must be woven from threads spun from twelve strands, from where do we derive this? As it is written: "And you shall make the robe of the ephod...

The robe from twelve strands – 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).