

HALAKHA

The curtain was made of twenty-four strands – פְּרוֹכֶת – עֲשָׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה: The curtain was made of four threads: White, sky-blue, purple, and scarlet. Each of these was a six-fold thread, yielding a count of twenty-four strands all together (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 7:16).

Each thread of the breastplate and ephod was made of twenty-eight strands – חוֹשֶׁן וְאַפֻּד עֲשָׂרִים וְשִׁמוֹנֶה: The ephod and the breastplate were made of five types of threads. There were four six-fold colored threads: Sky-blue, purple, scarlet, and white, plus a gold thread, yielding a count of twenty-eight threads (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:5).

NOTES

There would be eight – הוּוּ לְהוּ תַּמְנִיָּא: The Gemara does not explain why a thread of eight may not be made. Perhaps Rav Ashi accepts Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov's interpretation of "cords," which teaches there are at least four strands. As a rule, it is always assumed that the smallest quantity possible is indicated. Were one willing to accept the possibility that a multiple of four is included, there is no reason to make a distinction between eight, twelve, or even one hundred. Therefore, in this case, one should limit it to four strands (see *Tosafot* and *Maharsha*).

כְּלִיל תְּכֵלֶת וְיָלִיף תְּכֵלֶת תְּכֵלֶת מִפְּרוֹכֶת, מֵה לְהֵלֶן שֵׁשָׁה – אִף כָּאֵן כָּאֵן שֵׁשָׁה.

וְנִלְף מִשׁוּלָיו וְרַמְזוֹ, מֵה לְהֵלֶן שְׁמוֹנֶה – אִף כָּאֵן שְׁמוֹנֶה! דְּנִין כְּלִי מְכֻלִּי וְאִין דְּנִין כְּלִי מִתְּבַשֵּׁיט כְּלִי.

אֲדַרְבֵּהּ, דְּנִין גּוֹפוּ מִגּוֹפוֹ, וְאִין דְּנִין גּוֹפוּ מִמְּלֵמָא! הֵינֵי דְאִמְרִינן: לְשָׂאָר בְּגָדִים, שְׁלֵא נֵאמַר בְּהוּן שֵׁשׁ.

“פְּרוֹכֶת עֲשָׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה” אֲרַבְּעָה דְשִׂיתָא שִׂיתָא – לָא דִינָא וְלָא דִינָא.

“חוֹשֶׁן וְאַפֻּד עֲשָׂרִים וְשִׁמוֹנֶה” מִנָּא לֵן? דְּכֵתִיב: “וְעָשִׂיתָ חֹשֶׁן מִשֹּׁפֵט מַעֲשֵׂה חוֹשֶׁב כְּמַעֲשֵׂה אֲפֻד תַּעֲשֶׂנוּ זֶהָב תְּכֵלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מִשְׁזָר”, אֲרַבְּעָה דְשִׂיתָא שִׂיתָא – עֲשָׂרִין וָאַרְבָּעָה, זֶהָב אֲרַבְּעָה – הָא עֲשָׂרִין וְתַמְנִיָּא.

וְאִימָא זֶהָב נְמִי שֵׁשָׁה! אָמַר רַב אֲחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב, אָמַר קָרָא: “וְקָצַץ פְּתִילִים”, “פְּתִיל” פְּתִילִים” הָרִי כָּאֵן אֲרַבְּעָה.

רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר, אָמַר קָרָא: “לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּתוֹךְ הַתְּכֵלֶת וּבְתוֹךְ הָאַרְגָּמָן”. הֵיכִי נַעֲבִיד? נַעֲבִיד אֲרַבְּעָה דְתָרֵי תָרֵי – הוּוּ לְהוּ תַּמְנִיָּא, נַעֲבִיד תָרֵי דְתָרֵי תָרֵי, וְתָרֵי דְתָרֵי תָרֵי – “וְעָשִׂיתָ” שִׂיהִיו כָּל עֲשִׂוֹתָיו שְׁוֹת.

spun of sky-blue” (Exodus 28:31). And derive a verbal analogy from the term “sky-blue” used here and the same term “sky-blue” from the verse about the curtain: Just as there, with regard to the curtain, there are six strands, so too here, there are six strands. Then, since the Torah also says the threads are spun, i.e., each strand is made of two thinner strands spun together, each thread must contain twelve strands.

The Gemara suggests: Let us derive the number of strands in the robe from its hem and pomegranates: Just as there, each thread is spun from eight strands, so too here, the threads should be spun from eight strands. The Gemara rejects this: It is preferable to derive the halakhot of a utensil, i.e., the robe, from the halakhot of another utensil, i.e., the curtain, and one should not derive the halakhot of a utensil from the halakhot of something that is merely an ornament of a utensil, i.e., the pomegranates of the robe.

The Gemara asks: On the contrary, it is preferable to derive the halakhot of an object from that object itself, i.e., to assume that the halakhot of the robe and its pomegranates are similar; and one should not derive the halakhot of an object from elsewhere. The Gemara explains: This is precisely what we said in the baraita: One of the five mentions of shesh in the verse is to teach that the requirement that threads be made from six strands applies also to other garments about which shesh is not explicitly stated, such as the robe.

The baraita further states: Each thread of the curtain was made of twenty-four strands.<sup>h</sup> The Gemara explains: With regard to each thread being composed of four colored threads: White, purple, scarlet, and sky-blue, and each one of them being composed of six strands, there is neither judgment nor judge, i.e., it is absolutely clear that this is how the threads of the curtain are produced.

The baraita further states: Each thread of the breastplate and ephod was made of twenty-eight strands.<sup>h</sup> From where do we derive this? As it is written: “And you shall make a breastplate of judgment, the work of the skilled craftsman; like the work of the ephod you shall make it: Of gold, sky-blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen” (Exodus 28:15). There are four colored threads, each composed of six strands, which makes twenty-four. In addition, gold is spun together with each of the four colors, giving the total of twenty-eight.

But couldn't one say the gold should be made as a thread of six strands, like the other colors? Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said that the verse states: “And they beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into cords, to work it into the sky-blue, and into the purple, and into the scarlet, and into the fine linen, the work of a skilled craftsman” (Exodus 39:3). “Cord” implies a strand that is doubled over and can be twisted into a cord; “cords” is in the plural, meaning at least two of these. Accordingly, there are four strands here.

Rav Ashi said: This can be seen from that fact that the verse states with regard to the gold strands: “To work it into the sky-blue, and into the purple” (Exodus 39:3), indicating that the gold strands should be combined with the other colors. What should we do? If we make four gold threads of two strands each and combine each one with each of the colors, then there would be eight.<sup>n</sup> If we make two gold threads of two strands each, and two gold threads of one strand each, it says: “And you shall make,” indicating that all its makings should be the same. Perforce, one strand of gold should be combined with each of the colors, producing a total of twenty-eight strands.

**הַמְקַרַע בְּגָדֵי – קְהוֹנָה**: One who tears the opening of either the priestly robe or any other priestly garment in a destructive way is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:3).

**הַמְזוֹחֵחַ חוֹשֵׁן מֵעַל הָאֶפֶוד – קְהוֹנָה**: One who detaches the breastplate from the ephod in a destructive way is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:10).

**הַמְסוֹרֵי – אֲרוֹן**: One who removes a stave from the rings of the Ark is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:10).

אָמַר רַחֲבָא אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: הַמְקַרַע בְּגָדֵי קְהוֹנָה – לֹא יִקְרַע. שְׁנַאֲמַר: "לֹא יִקְרַע". מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אַחָא בְּרַי יַעֲקֹב: וְדִילְמָא הָכִי קָאָמַר רַחֲמָנָא: נַעֲבִיד לִיה שְׂפָה כִּי הֵיכִי דְלָא נִיקְרַע: מִי כְּתִיב "שְׂלֵא יִקְרַע"?

**S** The Gemara discusses various *halakhot* concerning the priestly vestments and other sacred vessels: **Rahava said that Rav Yehuda said: One who intentionally tears any of the priestly vestments<sup>NH</sup> transgresses a prohibition and is flogged, as it is stated concerning the robe: "It shall have a hem of woven work around the opening of it, like the opening of a coat of mail, and it shall not be torn"** (Exodus 28:32). Just as it is prohibited to tear the opening of the robe, so too, it is prohibited to tear any of the priestly vestments. **Rav Aha bar Ya'akov strongly objects to this: But perhaps this is what the Merciful One is saying in the Torah: An opening should be made in order that it not tear.** In other words, the Torah was giving an explanation, not a prohibition. The Gemara rejects this: **Is it written: In order that it not be torn?**<sup>N</sup> Clearly, the intention of the verse is to state a prohibition.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֱלֵעָזָר: הַמְזוֹחֵחַ חוֹשֵׁן מֵעַל הָאֶפֶוד, וְהַמְסוֹרֵי בְּגָדֵי אֲרוֹן – לֹא יִקְרַע, שְׁנַאֲמַר: "לֹא יִזַּח" וְ"לֹא יִסּוּרוּ". מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אַחָא בְּרַי יַעֲקֹב: וְדִילְמָא כִּי קָאָמַר רַחֲמָנָא – חֲדָקִינְהוּ וְעַבְדִּינְהוּ שְׂפִיר כְּדִי שְׂלֵא יִזַּח וְלֹא יִסּוּרוּ! מִי כְּתִיב "שְׂלֵא יִזַּח" וְ"שְׂלֵא יִסּוּרוּ"?

**Rabbi Elazar said: One who detaches the breastplate from upon the ephod<sup>H</sup> or one who removes the staves of the Ark<sup>H</sup> from their rings transgresses a Torah prohibition and is flogged, as it is stated: "And the breastplate shall not be detached from the ephod"**<sup>N</sup> (Exodus 28:28), and it is also stated: "The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it" (Exodus 25:15).<sup>N</sup> **Rav Aha bar Ya'akov strongly objects to this: But perhaps when the Merciful One said this in the Torah, the intention was to strengthen them and make them fast so that the breastplate not become detached from the ephod and the staves not be removed.** He suggests that the Torah was giving an explanation, not a prohibition. The Gemara rejects this: **Is it written: In order that it not become detached, and: In order that they not be removed?** Clearly, the intention of the verse is to state a prohibition.

רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא רַמִּי, כְּתִיב: "בְּטַבְּעוֹת הָאֲרוֹן יִהְיוּ הַבַּדִּים לֹא יִסּוּרוּ מִמֶּנּוּ", וְכְתִיב: "וְהוֹבֵא אֶת בְּדָיו בְּטַבְּעוֹת". הֲאֵי כִּיצַד? מִתְפָּרְקִין וְאִין נִשְׁמָטִין.

**Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, raised a contradiction.** In one verse it is written: "The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it" (Exodus 25:15), implying the staves should remain there permanently. But in another verse it is written: "And its staves shall be put into the rings" (Exodus 27:7), implying that when the Ark is used the staves are inserted, which suggests that they do not remain there permanently. **How is this contradiction resolved?** The staves could be removed from their position, i.e., they were loosened, but **did not come out.**<sup>N</sup> The staves were wider at their ends and thinner in the middle. Therefore, once they had been forced into the rings, although they could be shifted, they would not be removed entirely.

תֵּנִינָא נַמִּי הָכִי: "בְּטַבְּעוֹת הָאֲרוֹן יִהְיוּ הַבַּדִּים". יָכוֹל לֹא יִהְיוּ זָזִין מִמְּקוֹמָן – תִּלְמוּד לֹא מִי וְהוֹבֵא אֶת בְּדָיו בְּטַבְּעוֹת", אִי "וְהוֹבֵא אֶת בְּדָיו" יָכוֹל יִהְיוּ נִכְנָסִין וְיוֹצְאִין – תִּלְמוּד לֹא מִי: "בְּטַבְּעוֹת הָאֲרוֹן יִהְיוּ הַבַּדִּים", הֲאֵי כִּיצַד? מִתְפָּרְקִין וְאִין נִשְׁמָטִין.

**That was also taught in a baraita.** The verse states: "The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it" (Exodus 25:15). One might have thought that they should not move from their place at all; therefore, the verse states: "And its staves shall be put into the rings" (Exodus 27:7). If it had stated: **And its staves shall be put**, one might have thought that they are inserted and removed entirely; therefore, the verse states: "The staves shall be in the rings of the Ark; they shall not be removed from it" (Exodus 25:15). **How is this? They could be removed from their position, but did not come out.**

NOTES

**One who tears priestly vestments – קְהוֹנָה בְּגָדֵי**: In order for people to treat the priestly vestments with due care and honor, the Torah prohibited tearing them (*Sefer HaHinukh*). According to some halakhic authorities, there is a distinction between the robe and the other garments. One who tears the opening of the robe violates the prohibition even if he tears for constructive purposes, whereas one is liable for tearing the other garments only if he does so in a destructive manner (see *Yad David, Mishne LaMelekh, and Minhag Hinukh*).

**Is it written: In order that it not be torn – "שְׂלֵא יִקְרַע"**: The author of the *Korban Hagiga* notes that normally the Gemara does not explain explanatory clauses in the Torah as a distinct commandment. For example, the phrase: "And his heart shall not be led astray" (Deuteronomy 17:17) is understood as an

explanation for the *halakhot* restricting a king from marrying numerous wives. Why, then, is this case different? Some commentaries suggest that since the details of the Temple vessels and priestly vestments appear twice in the Torah, once when commanding how to construct them and once when describing their actual construction, and the explanatory clauses appear both times, it is therefore unlikely that these clauses come only to explain and not to add a new *halakha* (*Be'er Avraham*).

**Prohibition of detaching the breastplate – אִיסוּר הַזְּחָת חוֹשֵׁן**: Part of the glory and beauty of the Temple was that each item had its specific place within the Temple. This was also true of the priestly vestments. The prohibition to detach the breastplate is an expression of this idea (*Sefer HaHinukh*).

**Prohibition of removing the staves – אִיסוּר הַסְּרַת הַבַּדִּים**: Some

suggest that the reason the staves had to remain in position was for times when it was necessary to transport the Ark quickly to a different location. Were the staves not permanently in place, in the rush to move the Ark, the staves might not be inserted properly and the Ark might fall. Another explanation claims that the staves were not merely functional but part of structure of the Ark itself. As such, they had to always remain as part of the Ark (*Sefer HaHinukh*).

**מִתְפָּרְקִין וְאִין נִשְׁמָטִין – תִּסְרְפוּ**: According to Rashi, the staves were made in such a way that they could be removed only with great effort. *Tosafot* maintain that the staves' design allowed them to be removed with ease; nevertheless, the Levites were cautioned to move them only to transport the Ark, but never to remove them.

BACKGROUND

Acacia wood – עצי שטים: According to some scholars, the type of acacia wood mentioned here is from the *Faidherbia albida*, also known as the Ana tree. It can reach a height of 30 m and straight boards can be created from it.



Ana tree

NOTES

They supported their plating – שִׁמְעֵמִידִים אֶת צְפוּיִן: This meant that nails were not needed to hold the gold plating to the boards (Rabbi Elyakim; see Rashi and Tosafot).

Perek VII  
Daf 72 Amud b

NOTES

Priestly vestments – בגדי כהונה: The Ramban explains that the *serad* garments are the priestly vestments, as it would appear from the Gemara here. Indeed, in the Jerusalem Talmud there is a lengthy discussion about the atonement properties of the priestly garments, explaining which sin is atoned for by which garment. Rashi, however, explains that the *serad* garments were not priestly vestments at all; rather, they were the coverings for the Temple utensils.

HALAKHA

A sleeve made for the priestly vestments – בית יד של בגדי כהונה: The tunic of the priestly vestments, both for a common priest and a High Priest, is woven separately from the sleeves. The latter are later sewn to the body of the tunic (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:16).

Length of the sleeve – אורך בית היד: The sleeve of the priestly tunic reached as far as the palm of the hand (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:17).

אָמַר רַבִּי חָמָא בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: מַאי דְּכָתִיב: "עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים עֹמְדִים", שְׁעֹמְדִים דְּרַךְ גְּדִילְתָּן. דְּבַר אַחַר: "עֹמְדִים" – שִׁמְעֵמִידִין אֶת צְפוּיִן, דְּבַר אַחַר: "עֹמְדִים", שְׁמָא תֵּאמַר אָבֵד סַבְרֵן וּבִטְלָן סְבוּיִין – תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר: "עֹמְדִים" – שְׁעֹמְדִין לְעוֹלָם וּלְעוֹלָמִים.

אָמַר רַבִּי חָמָא בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא, מַאי דְּכָתִיב: "אֶת בְּגָדֵי הַשָּׂרָד לְשֵׂרֵת בְּקוֹדֶשׁ".

The Gemara cites other statements concerning the ark. Rabbi Hama, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "And you shall make the boards for the Tabernacle of acacia wood,<sup>8</sup> standing" (Exodus 26:15)? This verse teaches that the boards of wood used for the Tabernacle should stand in the same direction in which they grew from the ground as a tree. Alternatively, "standing" means that they supported their gold plating<sup>n</sup> and prevented it from falling. Alternatively, "standing" is written to hint at the following: Perhaps you will say that now that the Tabernacle is no longer in use, their hope is lost and their chance is abandoned, and after being stored away the boards will no longer return to use. Therefore, the verse states "standing" to indicate that they stand forever and ever.

§ The Gemara returns to its discussion of the priestly vestments: Rabbi Hama bar Hanina said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "The plaited [*serad*] garments, for serving in the Sanctuary" (Exodus 35:19)? Why does the verse refer to the priestly vestments as "*serad* garments"?

אֲלֵמָּלָא בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנָה לֹא נִשְׁתַּיֵּיר מִשְׁוֹנְאֵיהוֹן שְׁלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׂרִיד וּפְלִיט.

He offers a homiletic interpretation: Were it not for the priestly vestments,<sup>n</sup> which provide atonement for the Jewish people, there would not remain a remnant [*sarid*] or survivor from the haters of the Jewish people, a euphemism used to refer to the Jewish people themselves. Due to the atonement provided by the priestly vestments, a remnant [*sarid*] of the Jewish people does survive.

רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר, דְּבֵי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן תֵּנָא: בְּגָדִים שְׂגוּרִין אוּתָן כְּבָרֵייתָן מְכֻלֵּיהוֹן, וּמְשֻׂרְדִין מְהוֹן כְּלוּם, מַאי הֵיאָּר רֵישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: אֵילוּ מַעֲשֵׂה מַחַט.

Another interpretation: Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that the school of Rabbi Shimon taught: The priestly vestments are referred to as "*serad* garments" because they are garments that are woven in their completed form upon the loom, as opposed to weaving the material and then cutting and sewing pieces of the material together to create the required form, and then just a small part of them remains [*masridin*] which is not completed upon the loom. What is the remnant, the part that was not woven? Reish Lakish said: This is the needle-work required to complete the garment.

מִיתִיבֵי: בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנָה אֵין עוֹשִׂין אוּתָן מַעֲשֵׂה מַחַט אֲלֵא מַעֲשֵׂה אוּרְג, שְׁנַאָּמַר: "מַעֲשֵׂה אוּרְג!" – אָמַר אַבְיִי: לֹא נִצְרַכָּה אֲלֵא לְבֵית יָד שְׁלֵהֶם. כְּדִתְנַא: בֵּית יָד שְׁלֵ בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנָה נֶאֱרָגַת בְּפָנֵי עֲצָמָה וְנִדְבָקַת עִם הַבְּגָד, וּמִגַּעַת עַד פִּיסַת הַיָּד.

The Gemara raises an objection to this from a *baraita*: Priestly vestments should not be made through needle-work but through woven work, as it is stated: "Woven work" (Exodus 28:32). The Gemara answers that Abaye said: Reish Lakish's statement is necessary only for, i.e., refers only to, the sleeves. As it was taught in a *baraita*: A sleeve made for the priestly vestments<sup>h</sup> is woven separately and then attached to the garment by sewing, and the sleeve is made to reach as far as the palm of the hand.<sup>h</sup> However, the main body of the garment must indeed be made exclusively through weaving.

שָׁמָא תֵאמַר פְּחוּת הוּא – Perhaps you will say it is inferior – This superiority of the crown of Torah is alluded to by the subtle difference in the descriptions of the crowns of the different vessels. For the other sacred vessels, the Torah simply states: “You shall make a crown” (Exodus 25:25 and 30:3), whereas for the Ark the Torah specifies: “You shall make a crown upon it,” (Exodus 25:11). This suggests that the crown of the Ark, which symbolizes Torah, was raised above the rest (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

אָמַר רַחֲבֵה אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: שְׁלֹשׁ אֲרוֹנוֹת עָשָׂה בְּצִלְאֵל, אֲמַצְעֵי שֵׁל עַץ תִּשְׁעָה, פְּנִימֵי שֵׁל זָהָב שְׂמוֹנֶה, חִיצוֹן עֲשָׂרָה וּמִשְׁהוּ.

§ The Gemara cites statements concerning other Temple vessels: **Rahava said that Rav Yehuda said:** The Torah states that the Ark should be made of wood with gold plating inside and out (Exodus 25:10–11). In order to achieve this **Bezalel made three arks: A middle one made of wood**, whose height was **nine** handbreadths; **an inner one made of gold**, whose height was **eight** handbreadths; and an **outer one of gold**, whose height was **ten** handbreadths **and a bit**. These arks were nested.

וְהִתְנַיֵּא: אֶחָד עָשָׂר וּמִשְׁהוּ! לֹא קָשְׁיָא: הָא – כִּמְאֵן דְּאָמַר יֵשׁ בְּעַבְיֹו טַפַּח, הָא כִּמְאֵן דְּאָמַר אֵין בְּעַבְיֹו טַפַּח. וּמֵאֵי מִשְׁהוּ – זִיר.

The Gemara asks: **But wasn't it taught** in a *baraita* that the outer ark was **eleven** handbreadths **and a bit**? The Gemara explains: **This is not difficult: This statement in the baraita is in accordance with the one who said that the thickness of the gold plating was one handbreadth.** According to this opinion, the outer ark's base took up one handbreadth of its height, ten handbreadths were then needed to contain the middle ark within it, and then a bit more was needed so it could also contain the Ark's cover. **That statement of Rav Yehuda is in accordance with the one who said that the thickness of the gold plating was not one handbreadth** but was a plate of gold of negligible thickness. According to this opinion, the outer ark needed to be only ten handbreadths and a bit and could still contain the outer ark and have room for the cover. **And what is this additional bit?** It is the ornamental **crown** on the edge of the outer ark.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: שְׁלֹשָׁה זִירִים הָיוּ: שֵׁל מִזְבֵּחַ וְשֵׁל אֲרוֹן וְשֵׁל שֻׁלְחָן. שֵׁל מִזְבֵּחַ – זָכָה אֶהְיֶה וְנִטְלוּ, שֵׁל שֻׁלְחָן – זָכָה דָּוִד וְנִטְלוּ, שֵׁל אֲרוֹן – עַדִּיִן מוֹנֵחַ הוּא. כָּל הָרוֹצֵה לִיקַח – יָבֵא וְיִקַּח, שְׁמָא תֵאמַר פְּחוּת הוּא, תִּלְמוּד לֹא מְלָכִים יִמְלֹכוּ.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said: **There were three crowns** on the sacred vessels in the Temple: **The crown of the altar, and of the Ark, and of the table.** The regal appearance they provided symbolized power and authority: **The crown of the altar** symbolized the crown of priesthood; **Aaron was deserving and took it**, and the priesthood continues exclusively through his descendants. **The crown of the table** symbolized the abundance and blessing associated with the crown of kingship; **David was deserving and took it** for himself and his descendants after him. **The crown of the Ark** symbolized the crown of Torah; **it is still sitting** and waiting to be acquired, **and anyone who wishes to take** it may **come and take** it and be crowned with the crown of Torah. **Perhaps you will say it is inferior<sup>n</sup>** to the other two crowns and that is why nobody has taken it; therefore, **the verse states** about the wisdom of Torah: **“Through me kings will reign”** (Proverbs 8:15), indicating that the strength of the other crowns is derived from the crown of Torah, which is greater than them all.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן רַמֵּי: כְּתִיב “זֶר” וְקָרִינַן “זִיר”, זָכָה – נַעֲשִׂית לֹא זִיר, לֹא זָכָה – זָרָה הֵימְנוּ.

§ The Gemara presents a number of statements based on the idea that the Ark symbolizes the Torah: **Rabbi Yoḥanan raised a contradiction:** According to the way the word crown is written in the Torah (Exodus 25:11), without vowels, it should be pronounced *zar*, meaning strange, **but** according to the traditional vocalization we read it as *zeir*, meaning crown. These two ways of understanding the word appear to contradict each other. Rabbi Yoḥanan explains: The two understandings apply to two different situations: If one is **deserving** by performing mitzvot, **it becomes a crown [zeir] for him**; but if one is **not deserving**, the Torah will be a **stranger [zara] to him** and he will forget his studies.

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן רַמֵּי: כְּתִיב “וַעֲשִׂיתָ לְךָ אֲרוֹן עֵץ” וְכְתִיב “וַעֲשׂוּ אֲרוֹן עֵצֵי שִׁטִּים” – מְכַאֵן לְתַלְמִיד חָכָם שְׁבִי עִירוּ מְצוּוִין לַעֲשׂוֹת לֹא מְלֹאכְתּוֹ.

Rabbi Yoḥanan raised a contradiction: **It is written:** **“And you shall make for yourself a wooden Ark”** (Deuteronomy 10:1), implying that Moses alone was commanded to construct the Ark; **and it is written:** **“And they shall make an Ark of acacia wood”** (Exodus 25:10), implying that the Jewish people were all commanded to be involved in its construction. The apparent resolution to this contradiction is that although only Moses actually constructed the Ark, everyone was required to support the endeavor. So too, **from here** it is derived with regard to a **Torah scholar that the members of his town should perform his work for him** to support him and allow him to focus on his studies, since it is also the town's responsibility to enable him to study.

Drinks iniquity like water – שוֹתֵה כְּמִים עוֹלָה – The metaphor of drinking water illustrates well the image of a Torah scholar who learns Torah without his studies being discernible in his actions. In the same way, when a person has drunk water, there is still no change in his external appearance (Rabbi Elyakim).

Gehenna twice – תְּרַתִּי גֵיהֶנֶם: Others explain that a Torah scholar who does not fulfill the commandments is punished more severely than others. Additionally, he is punished for the Torah he learned without the associated fear of Heaven; it would have been better had he not studied, as indicated by the verse: “God says to the wicked: Who are you to recite My laws?” (Psalms 50:16). Therefore, in the World-to-Come he receives punishment in Gehenna that is twice as severe (Rav Ya’akov Emden).

To testify about those who study it – לְהַעֲדֵי בְלוֹמְדֶיהָ – Some explain this as a reference to the ultimate day of judgment, when the Torah itself will act as a witness to testify on behalf of those who were faithful to it. Others suggest that this means that the Torah will publicize the righteousness of those who were faithful to it (Ritva).

מִבֵּית וּמִחוּץ תִּצְפְּנוּ אָמַר רַבָּא: כָּל תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם שָׂאִין תּוֹכוֹ כְּבָרוֹ – אֵינוֹ תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם.

אָמַר אַבְיִי וְאִתִּימָא רַבָּה בַר עוּלָא: נִקְרָא נִתְעַב, שְׁנֵאמַר: “אֵף כִּי נִתְעַב וְנִאֲלַח אִישׁ שׁוֹתֵה כְּמִים עוֹלָה.”

אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן, מֵאֵי דְכָתִיב: “לִמָּוָה זֶה מְחִיר בְּיַד כְּסִיל לְקִנּוֹת חֲכָמָה וְלֹב אֵין” – אוֹי לָהֶם לְשׁוֹנְאֵיהֶן שֶׁל תַּלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים שְׁעוֹסְקִין בַּתּוֹרָה, וְאֵין בְּהֵן יִרְאת שָׁמַיִם.

מְכַרְזוּ רַבִּי יֵנְאִי: חָבַל עַל דְּלִית לֵיהּ דְּרַתָּא, וְתִרְעָא לְדְרַתִּיָּה עָבִיד.

אָמַר לְהוּ רַבָּא לְרַבְנָן: בְּמִטּוֹתָא מִינֵיכוֹן, לֹא תִירְתּוֹן תְּרַתִּי גֵיהֶנֶם.

אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי, מֵאֵי דְכָתִיב: “וְזֹאת הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר שָׂם מֹשֶׁה זָכָה – נִעֲשִׂית לֹא סָם חַיִּים, לֹא זָכָה – נִעֲשִׂית לֹא סָם מִיתָה. וְהֵינִי דְאָמַר רַבָּא: דְּאֹמְנָן לָהּ – סָמָא דְחַיִּיא, דְּלֹא אֹמְנָן לָהּ – סָמָא דְמוֹתָא.

אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי, רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן רָמִי: כְּתִיב “פְּקוּדֵי ה’ יִשְׂרָיִם מְשַׁמְחִי לֵב” וְכִתִּיב “אֲמַרְתָּ ה’ צְרוּפָה”, זָכָה – מְשַׁמְחִתּוֹ, לֹא זָכָה – צוֹרְפָתּוֹ. רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: מְגוּפִיָּה דְקָרָא נְפָקָא, זָכָה – צוֹרְפָתּוֹ לְחַיִּים, לֹא זָכָה – צוֹרְפָתּוֹ לְמוֹתָה.

“יִרְאֵת ה’ טְהוֹרָה עוֹמֶדֶת לְעַד” אָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: זֶה הִלּוּמֵד תּוֹרָה בְּטָהֳרָה. מֵאֵי הִיא – נוֹשֵׂא אִשָּׁה וְאַחַר כֵּךְ לּוֹמֵד תּוֹרָה.

“עֵדוּת ה’ נֶאֱמָנָה” אָמַר רַבִּי חֵיטָא בַר אֲבָא: נֶאֱמָנָה הִיא לְהַעֲדֵי בְלוֹמְדֶיהָ.

The verse states concerning the Ark: “From within and from without you shall cover it” (Exodus 25:11). Rava said: This alludes to the idea that any Torah scholar whose inside is not like his outside, i.e., whose outward expression of righteousness is insincere, is not to be considered a Torah scholar.

Abaye said, and some say it was Rabba bar Ulla who said: Not only is such a person not to be considered a Torah scholar, but he is called loathsome, as it is stated: “What then of one loathsome and foul, man who drinks iniquity like water” (Job 15:16).<sup>n</sup> Although he drinks the Torah like water, since he sins, his Torah is considered iniquitous and this makes him loathsome and foul.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Why is there a price in the hand of a fool to buy wisdom, as he has no heart?” (Proverbs 17:16)? This expresses the following sentiment: Woe to them, haters of Torah scholars, a euphemism for the Torah scholars themselves, who immerse themselves in Torah and have no fear of Heaven. They are fools; they try to acquire the wisdom of Torah, but since they have no fear of Heaven in their hearts they lack the ability to do so.

Rabbi Yannai declared that the situation may be expressed by the following sentiment: Pity him who has no courtyard but senselessly makes a gate for his courtyard. Fear of Heaven is like the courtyard, and the study of Torah is the gate that provides entrance to the courtyard. The study of Torah is purposeful only if it leads to fear of Heaven.

Rava said to the Sages in the study hall: I beg of you, do not inherit Gehenna twice.<sup>n</sup> By studying Torah without the accompanying fear of Heaven, not only are you undeserving of the World-to-Come, but even in this world you experience Gehenna, as you spend all your time in study and fail to benefit from worldly pleasure.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And this is the Torah which Moses put [sam] before the children of Israel” (Deuteronomy 4:44)? The word sam is written with the letter sin and means put; it is phonetically similar to the word sam written with the letter samekh, meaning a drug. This use of this word therefore alludes to the following: If one is deserving, the Torah becomes a potion [sam] of life for him. If one is not deserving, the Torah becomes a potion of death for him. And this idea is what Rava said: For one who is skillful in his study of Torah and immerses himself in it with love, it is a potion of life; but for one who is not skillful in his studies, it is a potion of death.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan raised a contradiction: It was written: “The precepts of the Lord are upright, gladdening the heart” (Psalms 19:9), but it is also written: “The word of the Lord is refining” (Psalms 18:31), which implies that the study of Torah can be a distressing process by which a person is refined like metal smelted in a smith’s fire. He reconciles these verses as follows: For one who is deserving, the Torah gladdens him; for one who is not deserving, it refines him. Reish Lakish said: This lesson emerges from that second verse itself: For one who is deserving, the Torah refines him for life; for one who is not deserving, it refines him for death.

The verse states: “Fear of the Lord is pure, it stands forever” (Psalms 19:10). Rabbi Hanina said: This is referring to one who studies Torah in purity; for such a person the Torah will remain with him forever. What is this; what does it mean to study in purity? One first marries a woman and afterward studies Torah. Since he is married, his heart will not be occupied with thoughts of sin, which could lead him to become impure.

In the same Psalm the verse states: “The testimony of God is faithful” (Psalms 19:8). Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said: This alludes to the fact that the Torah is faithful to testify about those who study it<sup>n</sup> and those who do not.

**מעשה – Work of an embroiderer and work of a designer** – רוקם ומעשה חושב: Whenever the Torah uses the phrase: “Work of a designer,” it indicates that the images are woven and are visible on only one side of the fabric. The phrase: “Work of an embroiderer” means that the images should look the same from either side of the fabric. This is in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Nehemya (see *Kesef Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 8:15).

**קִרְשֵׁת – The succession of the priest anointed for war** – משיח מלחמה: A priest anointed for war does not bequeath his position to his son. The son, however, may be appointed to the position on his own merits (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 4:21).

“מעשה רוקם” “מעשה חושב” אמר רבי אלעזר: שרוקמין במקום שחושבין.

The Gemara returns to its discussion concerning the sacred vessels: The verse states with regard to the covers for the Tabernacle that they are “work of an embroiderer” (Exodus 26:36), and it also states they are “work of a designer” (Exodus 26:31). How can both descriptions be reconciled? **Rabbi Elazar said: They embroidered the place where they had designed.** They first marked a design on the material in paint, and then they embroidered it.

תנא משמיה דרבי נחמיה: רוקם – מעשה מחט, לפיכך פרצוף אחד. חושב – מעשה אורג, לפיכך שני פרצופות.

A Sage taught in the name of Rabbi Nehemya: “Work of an embroiderer” refers to **needlework**, which therefore produces only **one face**. The design is made with a needle passing back and forth from both sides of the curtain, and consequently an identical parallel image, or one face, is formed on both sides. “Work of a designer” refers to **woven work**, which therefore produces **two faces**. Although formed together, the two sides of the material were not identical; for example, sometimes an eagle appeared on one side while a lion was on the other side.<sup>h</sup>

“באלו נשאלין באורים ותומים.” כי אתא רב דימי אמר: בגדים שבהן גדול משמש בהן משוח מלחמה משמש בהן, שנאמר: “ובגדי הקודש אשר לאהרן יהיו לבני אחריו” – למי שבא בגדולה אחריו.

It was taught in the mishna: When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the *Urim VeTummim*. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: The garments in which the High Priest serves are also worn when the priest anointed for war serves. This priest is appointed to recite words of encouragement to the nation before it goes out to war (see Deuteronomy 20:2). As it is stated: “And the sacred garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him” (Exodus 29:29), which is taken to refer to the one who comes after him in greatness, meaning the priest whose rank is one lower than the High Priest, i.e., the priest anointed for war.

מתביב רב אדא בר אבהו, ואמרי לה כדי: יכול יהא בנו של משוח מלחמה משמש תחתיו, בדרך שבנו של בהן גדול משמש תחתיו

Rav Adda bar Ahava raised an objection, and some say it unattributed: It is taught in a *baraita*: One might have thought that the son of the priest anointed for war serves in his place, i.e., he inherits the position, in the same way that the son of a High Priest serves in his place if he is fit for the job;<sup>h</sup>

Perek VII  
Daf 73 Amud a

תלמוד לומר: “שבעת ימים ילבשם הבהן תחתיו מבניו אשר יבא אל אהל מועד” – מי שראוי לבא אל אהל מועד, ואם איתא, מיחזא חזי!

therefore, the verse states: “Seven days shall he wear them, the one who serves in his stead from among his sons, who comes into the Tent of Meeting to serve in the Sanctuary” (Exodus 29:30). The verse describes a son serving in the place of his father, indicating that the position is inherited. The conclusion of the verse implies that the rule that a son inherits his father’s position applies only to a High Priest who is fit to enter the Tent of Meeting, but not to the priest anointed for war. Based on this *baraita*, the following challenge is posed: **And if it is so**, since the priest anointed for war also serves wearing the same garments as the High Priest, **he is also fit to enter the Tent of Meeting and should bequeath his position to his son.**

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק, הכי קאמר: כל שעיקר משיחתו לאהל מועד, יצא זה שעיקר משיחתו למלחמה.

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that this is what the *baraita* is saying: The rule that a son inherits his father’s position applies to anyone for whom the primary purpose of his anointment is to come and serve in the Tent of Meeting. That excludes this priest for whom the primary purpose of his anointment is for war.

מיתבי: משוח מלחמה אינו משמש לא בארבעה כהן הדיוט, לא בשמונה כהן גדול!

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Dimi’s claim: It was taught in a *baraita* that the priest anointed for war serves neither in four garments, like a common priest, nor in eight garments, like a High Priest.