

Work of an embroiderer and work of a designer – מעשה וּמְעֵשֶׂה חוֹשֵׁב: 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).

The succession of the priest anointed for war – יְרֵשֶׁת: 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 אוג, 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.^H

באלו נשאלין באורים ותומים. כי אתא רב דימי אמר: בגדים שבהן גדול משמש בהן משוח מלחמה משמש בהן, שנאמר: “ויבגדי 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.

מתניב רב אדא בר אבהו, ואמרי לה כדי: יכול יהא בנו של משוח מלחמה משמש תחתיו, כדרך שבנו של כהן 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;^H

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.

מיתניב: 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.

Due to the principle: One elevates in sanctity and one does not downgrade – משום מעלין בקדש ולא מורידין – *Tosafot Yeshanim* note that if the priest anointed for war remains in his position, then the reason he may not serve in four garments is that since by Torah law he should be serving in eight garments, it is prohibited for him to serve in fewer. Why does the Gemara suggest a different reason? They explain that the Gemara refers to a case where the priest was forced to step down from his position, e.g., because he became sick or elderly and could no longer go out to the battlefields and consequently another priest was appointed in his place. Since he no longer serves, there is no longer any prohibition for him to wear fewer than eight garments. However, because he retains the personal sanctity of a priest anointed for war, to now only wear four garments would be an infraction of the principle that one should not downgrade in matters of sanctity.

The bull brought for all the mitzvot – פֶּרֶק הַבָּא עַל כָּל הַמִּצְוֹת – According to Rashi and other commentators, the bull brought for all the mitzvot is the same as the bull of an anointed priest. The bull sacrificed as a sin-offering for the congregation is not mentioned here because essentially it is an offering of the community, not of the High Priest. As such, in the event that there was no High Priest, a common priest would sacrifice it (see *Tosafot Yeshanim* and *Ritva*).

אָמַר לִיָּה אֲבִי: אֵלֶּא זֶר מְשֻׁיָּת לִיָּה?
אֵלֶּא כְּכֹהֵן גָּדוֹל – מִשּׁוֹם אֵיבָה,
כְּכֹהֵן הַדְּיוֹט – מִשּׁוֹם מַעְלִין בְּקִדְשׁ
וְלֹא מוֹרִידִין.

אָמַר לִיָּה רַב אַדָּא בַר אַבְבָּא לְרַבָּא:
וְהֵאֵי תַנָּא דְלִית לִיָּה אֵיבָה, וְלֹא קָא
מִשְׁמַשׁ.

דְּתַנָּא: דְּבָרִים שְׂבִין בְּהֵן גָּדוֹל לְכֹהֵן
הַדְּיוֹט: פֶּר כֹּהֵן מְשֻׁיָּת, וּפֶר הַבָּא עַל כָּל
הַמִּצְוֹת, וּפֶר יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים, וְעֵשִׂירִית
הָאֵיפָה.

לֹא פוֹרַע וְלֹא פוֹרֵם, אֲבָל פוֹרֵם הוּא
מִלְמַטָּה, וְהַהֲדִיֹּט מִלְמַעְלָה, וְאֵין
מִטָּמֵא לְקַרְבָּיו, וּמִצְוָה עַל הַבְּתוּלָה,
וּמוֹזָהָר עַל הָאֵלֶּמְנָה, וּמְחִזֵּר אֶת
הַרוֹצֵחַ.

וּמְקַרֵּב אוֹזֵן וְאֵינוֹ אוֹכֵל, וְאֵינוֹ
חוֹלֵק, וְנוֹטֵל חֶלֶק בְּרֵאשׁ, וּמְקַרֵּב
חֶלֶק בְּרֵאשׁ, וּמְשַׁמֵּשׁ בְּשִׁמְנֵי בָּלִים,
וּפְטוּר עַל טוּמְאַת מִקְדָּשׁ וְקִדְשֵׁיו, וְכָל
עֲבוֹדוֹת יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים אֵינָן כְּשִׁירוֹת
אֵלֶּא בּוֹ.

וְכוֹלֵן נוֹהֲגוֹת בְּמִרְבֵּה בְּגָדִים, חוּץ
מִפֶּר הַבָּא עַל כָּל הַמִּצְוֹת.

Abaye said to him: Would you make him like a non-priest? If he dresses like neither a High Priest nor a common priest, then effectively he is like a non-priest, but that is certainly not true. Rather, the meaning of the *baraita* is that the priest anointed for war does not dress like a High Priest due to the animosity that could be caused between him and the High Priest if they both wore similar garments. Therefore, although according to Torah law the priest anointed for war should dress like a High Priest, the Sages decreed that he should not, out of concern that animosity might result. And he does not dress like a common priest, due to the principle: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade.^N Since the priest anointed for war attained the level of sanctity of a High Priest, he may not now be demoted to serve as an ordinary priest and dress accordingly.

Rav Adda bar Abba said to Rava: But there is this *tanna* of the following *baraita* who does not accept the concern of animosity as a reason to prevent one from wearing similar garments, and yet even according to him the priest anointed for war does not serve wearing the eight garments. Clearly, there must be a different reason.

As it was taught in a *baraita*: The matters in which there are differences between a High Priest and a common priest are as follows:

The bull of the anointed priest, also called the bull brought for all the mitzvot,^N which is brought for unwittingly deciding and following an erroneous halakhic ruling in a case for which one would be liable to receive the penalty of *karet* had he committed it intentionally;

And the bull of Yom Kippur;

And the tenth of an ephah that the High Priest offers each day.

Only the High Priest brings the above offerings.

In addition, when in mourning, a High Priest does not let his hair grow wild, nor does he rend his clothing in the way other mourners do. But he does rend his clothing from below, in a place that is not noticeable, while the common priest rends from above in the normal manner.

And he may not become ritually impure in the event of the death of his close relatives, but a common priest may.

And he is commanded to marry a virgin, and he is prohibited from marrying a widow, in contrast to a common priest who is prohibited to marry only a divorcee.

And his death allows the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge.

And he sacrifices offerings even when he is an acute mourner, i.e., on the first day of his mourning, but he may not eat from the offerings on that day and he may not take a portion from them.

And he takes his portion first from any offering of his choice.

And he has the first right to sacrifice any offering he wants.

And he serves wearing eight garments.

And he is exempt from bringing an offering for unwittingly causing ritual impurity to the Temple and its sacred objects.

And all parts of the Yom Kippur service are valid only when performed by him.

And all these *halakhot* unique to the High Priest are not limited to one who was consecrated with anointing oil, but apply also to a High Priest of many garments. During the Second Temple period, when the oil used for anointing was no longer available for anointing High Priests, the High Priests were consecrated by virtue of wearing the eight garments. This is true except with regard to the bull brought for all the mitzvot, which is brought only by a High Priest consecrated with anointing oil.

וכולן נהגות במשוח שעבר חוץ מפר יום
הכפורים ועשירית האיפה.

And all these *halakhot* apply to a former High Priest who had been consecrated to substitute for a High Priest who had become disqualified. If the disqualification of the original High Priest is removed, he may return to his position. Although the substitute no longer serves as a High Priest, he retains the sanctity of a High Priest and the *halakhot* of the High Priest continue to apply to him. This is true **except** with regard to the sacrifice of the bull on Yom Kippur and the sacrifice of the tenth of an ephah each day.

וכולן אין נהגות במשוח מלחמה, חוץ
מחמשה דברים האמורים בפרשה: לא
פורע, ולא פורם, ולא מטמא לקרוביו,
ומצויה על הבתולה, ומוזהר על האלמנה,
ומחזיר את הרוצח כדברי רבי יהודה,
וחכמים אומרים: אינו מחזיר.

And none of them applies to the priest anointed for war, except for the five items stated explicitly in the passage about the High Priest (Leviticus 21:10–15):

When in mourning, he does not let his hair grow wild nor does he rend his clothing in the way regular mourners do.

And he may not become ritually impure in the event of the death of his close relatives.

And he is commanded to marry a virgin, and he is prohibited from marrying a widow.

And his death allows the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehuda in tractate *Makkot* (11a). And the Rabbis say: His death does not allow the return of the accidental killer from the city of refuge.

כי לית ליה איבה – בדכּוּתיה, בדּוּטר
מיניה – אית ליה.

The *baraita* teaches that a former High Priest also wears the eight garments of the High Priest. It is therefore apparent that the *tanna* of the *baraita* is not concerned about animosity which could be caused if the High Priest and the former High Priest wear similar garments. Despite this, the *baraita* agrees that the priest anointed for war does not wear the eight garments. This suggests that the reason for this is not out of concern that animosity might result. The Gemara rejects this proof: **When the High Priest has no animosity toward someone else wearing the same garments, it is only where that person is similar to him**, such as a former High Priest who held the same rank. But toward someone inferior to him who wears the same garments, such as the priest anointed for war, he does feel animosity.^N

יתב רבי אבהו וקאמר לה להא שמעתא
משמיה דרבי יוחנן. אהדרניהו רבי אמי
ורבי אסי לאפיהו. איבא דאמרי רבי חייא
בר אבא אמרה ואהדרניהו רבי אמי ורבי
אסי לאפיהו.

The Gemara relates: Rabbi Abbahu was sitting before the Sages and saying this *halakha* of Rav Dimi, that the priest anointed for war serves in the same garments as the High Priest, in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan. Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi turned their faces away^N to show that they disagreed. Some say it was not Rabbi Abbahu but Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba who said it, and it was away from him that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi turned their faces.

מתקיף לה רב פפא: בשלמא רבי אבהו –
משום יקרא דבי קיסר, אלא לרבי חייא
בר אבא נימרו ליה מימר: לא אמר רבי
יוחנן הכי!

Rav Pappa strongly objects to the alternative account: **Granted**, if you say that Rabbi Abbahu reported the *halakha*, it is understandable that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi did not state outright that they disagreed with him **due to the honor of the house of the caesar**,^N as Rabbi Abbahu was close to the government (see *Hagiga* 14a). **But if the alternative account were true, then they should have said outright to Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba that they held that Rabbi Yoḥanan did not say this**, since there would have been no reason not to have done so. Therefore, Rav Pappa claimed this account must be incorrect.

כי אתא רבין אמר: נשאל איתמר. תנא
נמי הכי: בגדים שבהן גדול משמש בהן –
משוח מלחמה נשאל בהן.

The Gemara cites an opinion that conflicts with that of Rav Dimi: **When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: The teaching that the priest anointed for war wears the eight garments of the High Priest was stated only with regard to being consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim.** To be consulted he must wear all eight garments; however, he never serves in them. **That was also taught in a baraita: The garments in which the High Priest serves are also worn when the priest anointed for war is consulted for the decision of the Urim VeTummim.**^H

NOTES

Toward someone inferior to him he does feel animosity – בדּוּטר מיניה אית ליה – This observation is noted in several places in the Gemara. One feels animosity only toward someone who is less deserving and who nevertheless receives equal or preferable status.

Turned their faces away – לאפיהו... – The Sages would all sit facing the Sage who was currently expounding the *halakha*. When they wished to respond or show they disagreed, they would turn their faces toward the students who sat behind them.

The honor of the house of the caesar – יקרא דבי קיסר – Great respect was shown to the ruling government, even a non-Jewish one. For that reason, anyone who was close to the authorities was also treated with honor.

HALAKHA

The garments of the priest anointed for war – בגדי
משוח מלחמה: When the priest anointed for war serves in the Temple, he serves in the four garments of a common priest. This is in accordance with the opinion of Ravin (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 4:21).

How does one consult the *Urim VeTummim* – כִּיצַד שׂוֹאֲלִים – באורים ותומים: The priest stands facing the Ark, and the person who is asking stands behind the priest, facing him. The person who is asking states what he wishes to ask; he does not ask in a loud voice nor does he merely think the question in his head. Rather, he uses a soft voice, like one who prays alone. The Divine Spirit moves the priest, and he looks at the breastplate and sees a prophecy in the letters raised on it. The priest answers: Do this, or: Do not do that. One may not ask two questions together; however if one does, he is answered with regard to the first question alone (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 10:11).

NOTES

Toward the Divine Presence – כָּלְפֵי שְׂכִינָה: Rashi understands the Divine Presence as a reference to the *Urim VeTummim*. However, the Rambam understands it as a reference to the Ark (see Halakha note).

And he shall inquire for him – וְשָׂאֵל לוֹ: The phrase “for him” is apparently superfluous here. It comes to emphasize that no one else should hear his question.

And he shall inquire for him before God – וְשָׂאֵל לוֹ לִפְנֵי ה': If the verse had stated that the question is put to God, one might have concluded that thought alone is indeed sufficient, as God knows one's thoughts. However, the phrase “before God” indicates that he must turn to God only while his words are still audible (Maharsha).

תָּנוּ רַבֵּנּוּ: כִּיצַד שׂוֹאֲלִין? הַשּׂוֹאֵל פָּנָיו כְּלִפֵּי נִשְׂאָל, וְהַנִּשְׂאָל פָּנָיו כְּלִפֵּי שְׂכִינָה.

הַשּׂוֹאֵל אוֹמֵר: “אֶרְדּוּף אַחֲרַי הַגְּדוּד הַזֶּה” וְהַנִּשְׂאָל אוֹמֵר: כֹּה אָמַר ה' עֲלֵה וְהַצֵּלְחָה. רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: אֵין צָרִיךְ לוֹמַר “כֹּה אָמַר ה'” אֶלָּא “עֲלֵה וְהַצֵּלְחָה”.

אֵין שׂוֹאֲלִין בְּקוֹל – שְׂנַאֲמַר: וְשָׂאֵל לוֹ, לֹא מִהֲרִירוֹ בְּלִבּוֹ שְׂנַאֲמַר: “וְשָׂאֵל לוֹ לִפְנֵי ה'” אֶלָּא בְּדַרְכֵי שְׂנַאֲמָרָה חֲנִנָּה בְּתַפְלִיתָהּ, שְׂנַאֲמַר: “וְחֲנִנָּה הִיא מִדְּבַרְתָּ עַל לִבָּהּ”.

אֵין שׂוֹאֲלִין שְׁנֵי דְבָרִים בְּאַחַד, וְאֵין שָׂאֵל – אֵין מִחֲזִירֵין אֶלָּא אַחַד, וְאֵין מִחֲזִירֵין לוֹ אֶלָּא רֵאשׁוֹן, שְׂנַאֲמַר: “הִיסְגִּירוֹנִי בְּעַלְי קְעִילָה בְּיַד הַיָּרֵד שָׂאוֹל וְגו' וַיֹּאמֶר ה' יָרֵד” וְהָא אֲמַרְתָּ אֵין מִחֲזִירֵין אֶלָּא רֵאשׁוֹן! דְּוֹד שָׂאֵל

S The Sages taught: How does one consult the *Urim VeTummim*?^H The one asking stands with his face toward the one who is asked, i.e., the High Priest or the priest anointed for war. And the one who is asked, the High Priest, turns his face toward the Divine Presence,^N i.e., the *Urim VeTummim*, in which the explicit name of God is found, by tilting his head downward toward it.

The one who asks says his question, e.g.: “Shall I pursue after this troop?” (1 Samuel 30:8). And the one who is asked answers him according to the response he receives and says, for example: Thus says God: Go up and succeed. Rabbi Yehuda says: He need not say the words: Thus says God; rather, it is sufficient to relay the content of the response and say: Go up and succeed, since he is obviously only repeating what he was told.

One does not ask in a loud voice, as it is stated: “And he shall stand before Elazar the priest, who shall inquire for him^N by the judgment of the *Urim*” (Numbers 27:21), which implies that the inquiry is to be audible only to the person asking. And he should not think his question in his heart but should enunciate it, as it is stated: “And... who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the *Urim* before God” (Numbers 27:21),^N and immediately afterward it states: “By his mouth” (Numbers 27:21). Rather, how shall he inquire? He should do so akin to the way that Hannah spoke in her prayer, as it is stated: “Now Hannah spoke in her heart; only her lips moved, but her voice could not be heard” (1 Samuel 1:13), which indicates she did enunciate the words but spoke so quietly that no one else could hear.

One does not ask about two matters simultaneously; rather, one asks one question, and after he is answered he asks a second question. And even if he asks about two matters simultaneously, he is answered only with regard to one of them, and he is answered only with regard to the first question. As it is stated with regard to King David that he asked two questions simultaneously: “Will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hand? Will Saul come down?” (1 Samuel 23:11). And he was answered with regard to only one: “And God said: He will come down.” (1 Samuel 23:11). The Gemara asks: But didn't you say that if one asks two questions, he is answered only with regard to the first question? Yet the verse states that David received an answer for his second question, not the first. The Gemara answers: David asked the questions

Perek VII
Daf 73 Amud b

NOTES

He was answered in order – הַחֲזִירוֹ לוֹ כְּסֵדֶר: The statement that one is answered with regard to the first question first means that one is first answered with regard to the logically first question, even if he asked it second (Ritva). In the Jerusalem Talmud a different explanation is cited, based on this verse: If one asks two questions he is answered only, if at all, with regard to the second question.

שָׂאֵל כְּסֵדֶר, וְהַחֲזִירוֹ לוֹ כְּסֵדֶר. וְכִינּוּן שְׂנַאֲמָרָה שְׂשָׂאֵל שְׂשָׂאֵל כְּסֵדֶר – חֲזוֹר וְשָׂאֵל כְּסֵדֶר, שְׂנַאֲמַר: “הִיסְגִּירוֹנִי בְּעַלְי קְעִילָה אוֹתִי וְאֶת אֲנָשָׁי בְּיַד שָׂאוֹל וַיֹּאמֶר ה' יִסְגִּירוֹ”.

וְאִם הוּצָרַךְ הַדְּבָר לְשִׁנּוּם – מִחֲזִירֵין לוֹ שְׁנַאֲמַר: “וַיִּשְׂאֵל דָּוִד בַּה' לֵאמֹר הֲאֶרְדּוּף אַחֲרַי הַגְּדוּד הַזֶּה הֲאִשְׁגִּינּוּ” וַיֹּאמֶר (ה') לוֹ רְדּוּף כִּי הִשָּׁג תִּשְׁגֵּי וְהַצֵּל תִּצְלִי”.

out of order and he was answered in order.^N He should have asked first whether Saul would come down, and afterward what the people of Keilah would do. And once he realized that he had asked out of order he went back and asked in order, as it is stated immediately afterward: “Will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And God said: They will deliver you” (1 Samuel 23:12).

But if the matter is urgent and requires asking two questions simultaneously, there being no time to follow the standard protocol, one may ask both questions simultaneously and he is answered with regard to the two questions together, as it is stated: “And David asked of God, saying: Shall I pursue after this troop? Will I overtake them? And He answered him: Pursue, for you will surely overtake them, and will surely rescue” (1 Samuel 30:8).

A decree of the *Urim VeTummim* cannot be retracted – גְּזֵרַת אֲוִרִים וְתוּמִים אֵינָה חוֹזֶרֶת: The words of a prophet are stated before the fact and not necessarily in a moment of emergency. As one has the opportunity to consider and repent, the statements of prophets sometimes serve as warnings. In the case of the *Urim VeTummim*, on the other hand, there is no chance to affect the outcome, and therefore the answer given is precisely what will happen (*Me'ir*).

How is it done – כִּיצַד נֶעֱשִׂית: The Ritva explains (see also the commentary of the Ramban to Exodus 28:30) that the *Urim VeTummim* was pieces of parchment on which God's sacred names were written. These were inserted into the folds of the breastplate, and they would cause the letters to light up. In the Jerusalem Talmud, an opinion is cited that the priest would hear the answer out loud.

Protrude...join – מְצַטְרֵפוֹת: Rashi assumes that Rabbi Yohanan and Reish Lakish debate whether the letters remained in place and the priest had to decipher the message, or whether the letters would themselves form the answer. However, the Ritva assumes they do not disagree. Rather, first the letters would protrude, and then afterward they would rearrange themselves to form the words of the answer.

But *tzadi* is not written – וְהָא לֹא כְּתִיב בְּהוּ צַדִּי: Later commentaries ask why the Gemara does not ask about earlier letters in the alphabet, such as *het*; this question is also raised in the Jerusalem Talmud. Apparently, the Gemara's question is based on the message cited above from the book of Samuel, which included the letter *tzadi*. The Gemara's answer explains where the letters *het* and *kuf* came from; therefore, the Gemara proceeds to ask only about the letter *tet*.

וְאֵף עַל פִּי שְׁגִיזֵרֵת נִבְיָא חוֹזֶרֶת, גְּזֵרַת אֲוִרִים וְתוּמִים – אֵינָה חוֹזֶרֶת, שְׁנֵאמַר: "בְּמִשְׁפַּט הָאֲוִרִים."

The Gemara notes the reliability of the *Urim VeTummim*: Even though a decree of a prophet can be retracted, as sometimes a dire prophecy is stated as a warning and does not come true, a decree of the *Urim VeTummim* cannot be retracted.^N As it is stated: "By the judgment of the *Urim*" (Numbers 27:21). The use of the term judgment suggests that the decree is as final as a judicial decision.

לְמָה נִקְרָא שְׁמֵן אֲוִרִים וְתוּמִים? אֲוִרִים – שְׁמֵאִירִין אֶת דְּבָרֵיהֶן, תוּמִים – שְׂמִשְׁלִימִין אֶת דְּבָרֵיהֶן.

Why is it called *Urim VeTummim*? *Urim*, which is based on the word *or*, light, is so called because it illuminates and explains its words. *Tummim*, which is based on the word *tam*, completed, is because it fulfills its words, which always come true.

וְאִם תֹּאמַר: בְּגִבְעַת בְּנִמִּין מִפְּנֵי מָה לֹא הִשְׁלִימוּ?

And if you say: In the battles following the incidents in Gibeah of Benjamin (Judges 19–20), why did the *Urim VeTummim* not fulfill its words? The Jewish People consulted the *Urim VeTummim* three times with regard to their decision to attack the tribe of Benjamin, and each time they were instructed to go to battle. However, the first two times they were defeated and only on the third attempt were they successful. Is this not proof that the *Urim VeTummim* does not always fulfill its words?

הֵם שָׁלָא בִּיחְנוּ אִם לְנִצָּח אִם לְהִנָּצַח וּבְאַחֲרוֹנָה שְׂבִיחְנוּ – הִסְכִּימוּ, שְׁנֵאמַר: "וּפְנַחְסָ בֶן אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן אֶהֱרֹן עוֹמֵד לְפָנָיו בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם לֵאמֹר הַאֲוִסִּיף עוֹד לְצֵאת לְמִלְחָמָה עִם בְּנֵי בְנִמִּין אֲחֵי אִם אֶחָדָל וַיֹּאמֶר ה' עֲלוּ כִּי מָחָר אֶתְנַנּוּ בְיָדְךָ."

The Gemara answers: The first two times they did not check with the *Urim VeTummim* whether they would be victorious or be defeated but only inquired how and whether they should go to battle. Had they asked, they indeed would have been told that they would not succeed. But on the last time, when they did check and inquire whether they would be successful, the *Urim VeTummim* agreed with them that they should go to battle and that they would succeed, as it is stated: "And Pinehas, the son of Elazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days, saying: Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin my brother, or shall I cease? And God said: Go up, for tomorrow I will deliver him into your hand" (Judges 20:28).

כִּיצַד נֶעֱשִׂית? רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: בּוֹלְטוֹת, רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: מְצַטְרֵפוֹת.

How is it done?^N How does the *Urim VeTummim* provide an answer? The names of the twelve tribes were engraved upon the stones of the breastplate. These letters allowed for the answer to be received. Rabbi Yohanan says: The letters of the answer protrude, and the priest then combines those letters to form words in order to ascertain the message. Reish Lakish says: The letters rearrange themselves and join^N together to form words.

וְהָא לֹא כְּתִיב בְּהוּ צַדִּי! אָמַר רַב שְׁמוּאֵל בְּרַי יִצְחָק: אֲבָרְהָם יִצְחָק וַיַּעֲקֹב כְּתִיב שָׁם. וְהָא לֹא כְּתִיב טִיִּית! אָמַר רַב אֲחָא בְּרַי יִצְחָק: "שְׁבִטֵי יִשְׁרוּן" כְּתִיב שָׁם.

The Gemara asks: How was it possible to receive an answer to every question? But the letter *tzadi* is not written^N within the names of the twelve tribes engraved on the breastplate's stones. Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak said: The names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were also written there. The name *Yitzhak*, Isaac, contains the letter *tzadi*. The Gemara asks again: But surely the letter *tet* was not written on the breastplate, since it is not found in the names of the Patriarchs nor in the names of the twelve tribes. Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said: *Shivtei Yeshurun*, the tribes of Jeshurun, was also written there. The word *shivtei*, tribes, contains the letter *tet*. In this way the entire alphabet was represented.^H

HALAKHA

What was written on the breastplate – מָה כְּתִיב בְּחוֹשֶׁן: The names of the twelve tribes are written on the breastplate, along with the names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob written above the name Reuben, and *Shivtei Yah*, the tribes of God, written below the name Benjamin, so that all the letters of the alphabet are represented (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:7). The *Kesef Mishne* questions the source of Rambam's phrase

Shivtei Yah, since the Gemara here has *Shivtei Yeshurun* and the Jerusalem Talmud has *Shivtei Yisrael*, the tribes of Israel. The *Kesef Mishne* writes that perhaps the Rambam thought that it made no difference what the second word was, since the phrase was necessary only for the *tet* in the word *Shivtei*. Therefore, he chose a term that appears in the Bible (see Psalms 122:4).

Any priest who does not speak with Divine Spirit – כל כהן – שאינו מדבר ברוח הקדש: See II Samuel 15, which recounts that upon his flight from Absalom, David wished to consult with the *Urim VeTummim*. He first asked Ebiathar to consult it, but he was not answered. David therefore removed him from the High Priesthood. Zadok was then installed in his place, and when he consulted the *Urim VeTummim* he was answered. The verse: “Zadok the priest who saw” (II Samuel 15:27), alludes to Zadok’s divine inspiration (see Rashi).

מִיִּתְיָבִי: כֹּל כֹּהֵן שֶׁאֵינוֹ מְדַבֵּר בְּרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְשִׁכִּינָה שׁוֹרָה עָלָיו – אֵין שׁוֹאֲלִין בּוֹ, שֶׁהֵרִי שָׁאֵל צְדוּקָא וְעֵלְתָהּ לוֹ, אֲבִיָּתָר וְלֹא עֵלְתָהּ לוֹ, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: “וַיַּעַל אֲבִיָּתָר עַד תּוֹם כָּל הָעָם” וְגו’.

The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: Any priest who does not speak with Divine Spirit⁶ and upon whom the Divine Presence does not rest is not consulted to inquire of the *Urim VeTummim*. As Zadok inquired of the *Urim VeTummim* and it was effective for him, and he received an answer; but Ebiathar inquired and it was not effective for him, and he did not receive an answer. As it is stated: “But Ebiathar went up until all the people had finished” (II Samuel 15:24), which is taken to mean that he was removed from the High Priesthood since the Divine Spirit had departed from him.

סִיּוּעֵי הָהוּה מְסִיּוּעֵי בַּהֲדִיּוּהוּ.

The Gemara asks: If it is true that the letters of the breastplate protrude or even join together to form the answer, why does the High Priest need the Divine Spirit and Divine Presence to be with him? And if he has the Divine Spirit and Divine Presence with him, why does he need the *Urim VeTummim*? The Gemara answers: The Divine Spirit assisted the *Urim VeTummim*. In other words, the letters formed the answer only if the High Priest himself was worthy, but his divine inspiration was not great enough to provide an answer without them.

“וְאֵין שׁוֹאֲלִין אֶלֶּא לְמַלְךְ”. מִנָּא הֵינּוּ מִיִּלֵּי? אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָהוּ: דְּאָמַר קָרָא: “וְלִפְנֵי אֵלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן יַעֲמֵד וְשָׁאֵל לוֹ בְּמִשְׁפַּט הָאוּרִים” וְגו’ הוּא – זֶה מַלְךְ, “וְכָל [בְּנֵי] יִשְׂרָאֵל אִתּוֹ” – זֶה מִשׁוּחַ מִלְחָמָה, “וְכָל הָעֵדָה” – זֶה סַנְהֶדְרִין.

It was taught in the mishna: And the High Priest 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. From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Abbahu said that the verse states: “And he shall stand before Elazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the *Urim* before God; by his mouth they shall go out, and by his mouth they shall come in, both he and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation” (Numbers 27:21). Each phrase describes a different circumstance in which the *Urim VeTummim* may be consulted: “He”; this is a reference to a king, as “he” refers to Joshua, who had the status of a king. “All the children of Israel with him”; this is a reference to the priest anointed for war, as all of the Jewish people follow him to war according to his instruction. “Even all the congregation”; this is a reference to the Sanhedrin, who are the heads of the Jewish people.

הדרן עלך בא לו כהן גדול

מתני' יום הכפורים אסור באכילה, ובשתיה, וברחיצה, ובסיכה, ובנעילת הסנדל, ובתשמיש המטה. והמלך והכלה ירחצו את פניהם, והתיה תנעול את הסנדל, דברי רבי אליעזר, וחכמים אוסרין.

האוכל כבותבת הגסה, כמותה ובגרעינתה, והשותה מלא לוגמיו – חייב. כל האוכלים מצטרפין לכבותבת, וכל המשקין מצטרפין למלא לוגמיו. האוכל ושותה אין מצטרפין.

גמ' אסור? ענוש כרת הוא! אמר רבי אילא, ואיתימא רבי ירמיה: לא נצרכה אלא לחצי שיעור.

הניחא למאן דאמר חצי שיעור אסור מן התורה, אלא למאן דאמר חצי שיעור מותר מן התורה, מאי איבא למימר? דאיתמר, חצי שיעור,

MISHNA On Yom Kippur, the day on which there is a mitzva by Torah law to afflict oneself,^{NH} it is prohibited to engage in eating and in drinking, and in bathing,^N and in smearing oil on one's body, and in wearing shoes,^N and in conjugal relations. However, the king, in deference to his eminence, and a new bride within thirty days of her marriage, who wishes to look especially attractive at the beginning of her relationship with her husband, may wash their faces^H on Yom Kippur. A woman after childbirth, who is suffering, may wear shoes because going barefoot causes her pain. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. The Rabbis prohibit these activities for a king, a new bride, and a woman after childbirth.

The mishna elaborates: One who eats a large date-bulk of food, equivalent to a date and its pit,^H or who drinks a cheekful of liquid on Yom Kippur is liable^H to receive the punishment of *karet* for failing to fulfill the mitzva to afflict oneself on Yom Kippur. All foods that one eats join together to constitute a date-bulk; and all liquids that one drinks join together to constitute a cheekful. However, if one eats and drinks, the food and beverage do not join together^N to constitute a measure that determines liability, as each is measured separately.

GEMARA The Gemara expresses surprise at the mishna's terminology, which states that it is prohibited to eat and drink on Yom Kippur. Why does the mishna use the word prohibited, which indicates that these activities are only sinful? It is, after all, punishable by *karet* if he eats, and the mishna should have used the more accurate word liable. Rabbi Ila said, and some say that Rabbi Yirmeya said: This term is needed only for a half-measure,^H meaning that if one eats less than the amount that incurs the punishment of *karet*, he still violates a prohibition.

The Gemara asks: This explanation works out well according to the one who said that a half-measure is prohibited by Torah law even though it does not incur a punishment. But according to the one who says that a half-measure is permitted by Torah law, and that it is the Sages who prohibit eating less than a full measure, what is there to say about the terminology, as it was stated that *amora'im* debated the nature of a half-measure of a forbidden substance?

HALAKHA

Prohibitions for the sake of affliction on Yom Kippur – איסורים: On Yom Kippur, it is prohibited to eat or drink, bathe or smear oneself with oil, wear leather shoes, or engage in conjugal relations. One is liable to receive *karet* only for eating or drinking (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 611:1).

The king and a bride may wash their faces – המלך והכלה: The king may wash his face on Yom Kippur, in deference to his status, to allow people to see his beauty. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as the Gemara rules according to his opinion (*Hagahot Maimoniyot; Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Shevitah Asor* 3:1). A bride is allowed to wash her face if Yom Kippur is within thirty days after her wedding. This leniency is not observed in modern times, as the entire community spends the day in the synagogue, where the husband does not see his bride (*Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 613:10).

The measure of food that determines liability for eating on

Yom Kippur – שיעור אכילה ביום הכפורים: One who eats on Yom Kippur an amount of food equal to the volume of a large date, which is slightly smaller than an egg-bulk, is liable. All types of food are combined to reach this measure, as stated in the mishna (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 612:1).

The measure of liquid that determines liability for drinking on Yom Kippur – שיעור שתיה ביום הכפורים: One who drinks a cheekful of beverage on Yom Kippur is liable. All types of drink can be combined to reach this measure (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 612:9).

Half-measure – חצי שיעור: If one ate or drank less than a full measure on Yom Kippur he is not liable to receive *karet*, although such an act is prohibited by Torah law. One who eats or drinks a half-measure receives lashes by rabbinic decree. This ruling follows Rabbi Yohanan, in his dispute with Reish Lakish (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Shevitah Asor* 2:3).

NOTES

Five methods of affliction – תמשה עיניים: There are five methods of affliction required on Yom Kippur. Eating and drinking count as one. The medieval commentaries disagree on whether all are mandated by Torah law (Rambam), or if only eating and drinking are Torah prohibitions and the rest are rabbinic (*Tosefot Yom Tov; Rosh; see Rabbeinu Nissim*).

Bathing – רחיצה: Because bathing is usually done with water, a separate prohibition against smearing with oil had to be specified. Some authorities distinguish between bathing, which is prohibited for any purpose, and smearing oil on oneself, which is prohibited only for pleasure (see Rav Shmuel Strashun).

Wearing shoes [ne'ilat hasandal] – נעילת הסנדל: Although the use of footwear was not yet universal during the time of the Mishna, it was more common in urban areas and sandals were the common form of footwear. By the time of the Gemara, shoes became commonplace and it was considered unusual to walk around barefoot. The Hebrew word *sandal* does not refer only to open footwear; wearing any kind of leather shoe is prohibited.



Ancient sandal found at Masada

If one eats and drinks, the food and beverage do not join together – האוכל והשותה אין מצטרפין: Commentaries ask why the Gemara does not simply say that food and beverages do not combine (see *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*). Some suggest that even according to the opinion that food and drinks do combine with regard to other *halakhot*, the issue is one's frame of mind with regard to Yom Kippur. For this reason, the question is presented from his perspective (see *Sifah Yitzhak* and *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

NOTES

Tereifa – טריפה: Generally speaking, a *tereifa* is an animal that is suffering from a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months. It is prohibited by the Torah to eat an animal that has been injured or is stricken with a disease of this nature, although the actual source for this prohibition is a matter of dispute. Some authorities cite Exodus 22:30: “You shall not eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field,” while others suggest Deuteronomy 14:21: “You shall not eat of any thing that died of itself.” According to the *Minhat Hinnukh* and others, both verses together serve as the source for the prohibition.

HALAKHA

He was already sworn and obligated at Mount Sinai – מושבע ועומד מהר סיני הוא: One who swears not to eat and then eats foods prohibited by the Torah is exempt from the punishment incurred for breaking an oath. If one swears not to eat any amount of food from a *neveilla* or a *tereifa* and eats less than an olive-bulk, he is liable with regard to the oath because at Mount Sinai he was not swear off eating less than a full measure (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Shevuot* 5:7, and in the comments of the *Kesef Mishne* and *Lehem Mishne*).

רבי יוחנן אמר: אסור מן התורה, ריש לקיש אמר: מותר מן התורה. הניחא לרבי יוחנן, אלא לריש לקיש מאי איבא למימר? מודה ריש לקיש שאסור מדרבנן.

אי הכי לא ניחייב עליה קרבן שבועה, אלמא תנן: שבועה שלא אוכל, ואכל נבילות וטריפות שקצים ורמשים – חייב, ורבי שמעון פוטר.

והוינן בה: אמאי חייב? מושבע ועומד מהר סיני הוא! רב ושמואל ורבי יוחנן דאמרי: בכלל דברים המותרים עם דברים האסורים.

וריש לקיש אמר: אי אתה מוצא אלא במפרש חצי שיעור ואליבא דרבנן, או בסתם,

Rabbi Yohanan said: It is prohibited by Torah law, and the Torah prohibits even a minute amount of forbidden substance. Reish Lakish said: It is permitted by Torah law. This explanation works out well according to the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan. However, according to the opinion of Reish Lakish, what can be said? The Gemara answers: Reish Lakish concedes that a half-measure is prohibited by rabbinic law. If so, Reish Lakish, too, will say that eating or drinking a half-measure is prohibited on Yom Kippur, by rabbinic law.

The Gemara asks: If so, if according to Reish Lakish there is a rabbinic prohibition to eat a half-measure, one should not be liable to bring an offering for breaking an oath to eat a half-measure of forbidden foods. Why, then, did we learn in a mishna otherwise: He who swore the following oath, an oath that I will not eat, and then ate unslaughtered animal carcasses, *tereifot*,^N reptiles, or creeping animals, he is liable to bring an offering for violating his oath. Rabbi Shimon exempts him.

And we discussed it: Why should he be liable for breaking an oath? He was already sworn and obligated at Mount Sinai,^H along with the rest of the Jewish people, not to eat these things. According to *halakha*, an oath does not take effect if it contradicts a previously existing oath. The second oath to not eat has no effect in terms of eating forbidden foods, so why should one be liable for breaking it? Rav, and Shmuel, and Rabbi Yohanan say with regard to this: Here we are dealing with a case where one includes permitted foods with forbidden foods. This means that had one sworn only not to eat unslaughtered animal carcasses or *tereifot* and then ate them, he would not be liable for breaking the oath because he was already sworn not to eat those foods. However, if one swore not to eat at all, his oath takes effect on permitted foods. Consequently, if he eats any food he is liable.

And Reish Lakish said: The only application of this mishna you will find is in a case where one explicitly says that he will not eat a half-measure, and this is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. They say that when one swears that he will not eat, he prohibits himself only from eating a whole measure of food. If he eats a half-measure, he has not violated a prohibition. Therefore, in order for a half-measure to be prohibited, he needs to specify this in his oath. Or, you find it in the case of one who makes no specification at all of a half-measure,

Perek VIII

Daf 74 Amud a

NOTES

An oath of testimony – שבועת העדות: The laws of an oath of testimony are mentioned in the Torah (Leviticus 5:1) and are explored in depth in tractate *Shevuot*. If a litigant finds witnesses who are capable of testifying on his behalf and has them swear that they will testify, they must bring a particular type of sin-offering if they do not then testify. This issue is considered a detail of monetary law, and the oath takes effect only with regard to one who is eligible to give testimony.

To exclude a king – למעוטי מלך: The Sages debate whether the freedom that a king has from testifying is a Torah exemption to preserve his honor or a rabbinic exemption relating to the kings of the northern kingdom of Israel, who did not observe Torah law (see *Tosefet Yom HaKipurim*; *Gevurat Ari*). In practice, a king does not take the oath of testimony.

ואליבא דרבי עקיבא, דאמר: אדם אוסר עצמו בכל שהוא.

וכי תימא בין דאית ליה היתר מן התורה – קא חייל קרבן שבועה, והתנן: שבועת העדות אינה נוהגת אלא בראויין להעיד. והוינן בה: למעוטי מאי? רב פפא אמר: למעוטי מלך.

and the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: A man prohibits himself from any amount. If a man swears that he will not eat, he thereby prohibits himself from eating even the smallest amount of food. Therefore, Reish Lakish himself maintains that eating a half-measure does not constitute a prohibition.

And if you say: Perhaps Reish Lakish maintains that since a half-measure is permitted by Torah law, despite the fact that it is prohibited by rabbinic law, one is liable to bring an offering for violating an oath, then there is the following problem: Didn't we learn in a mishna: An oath of testimony^N where one is sworn to give testimony on something that he saw or knew, applies only to those who are eligible to give testimony. If one who is ineligible to testify swears an oath to give testimony, the oath is invalid even if he does not testify. And we discussed it: The statement: Those who are eligible to give testimony, comes to exclude what? After all, it was already said that the oath does not apply to women, relatives, and other disqualified people. Rav Pappa said: It comes to exclude a king.^N A king is not disqualified from giving testimony, but he does not testify before a court, due to the requirement to give respect to a king.