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.

It was taught in the mishna: When dressed in these eight garments, the High Priest may be consulted for the decision of the Ursim 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 23:2). 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.

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.

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 reconciled it. They first marked a design on the material in paint, and then they embroidered it.

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.

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.

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.
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. 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.

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, which is brought for unworthy priestings 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 he sacrifices offerings even when he is an acute mourner, i.e., 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.
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.

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.

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. And toward someone inferior to him who wears the same garments, such as the priest anointed for war, he does feel animosity.⁸

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 away⁹ 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.

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,⁸ as Rabbi Abbahu was close to the government (see Haggiga 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.

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.⁹

NOTES

Toward someone inferior to him he does feel animosity — 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, as Rabbi Abbahu was close to the government (see Haggiga 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.

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.
How does one consult the *Urim VeTummim*? 

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, 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” 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), 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 1:15), 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 out of order and he was answered in order. 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).
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.¹ 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.

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.

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?

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 Pinchas, 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 20:18).

How is it done? 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 together to form words.

The Gemara asks: How was it possible to receive an answer to every question? But the letter *tazadi* is not written 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 *tazadi*. 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 Yakov said: *Shivtei Yisrael*, the tribes of Israel, was also written there. The word *shivtei*, tribes, contains the letter *tet*. In this way the entire alphabet was represented.²

---

¹ 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’iri).

² Later commentaries ask why the Gemara does not ask about earlier letters in the alphabet, such as *he*. 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 *tazadi*. The Gemara’s answer explains where the letters *het* and *af* came from; therefore, the Gemara proceeds to ask only about the letter *tet*. 

---

What was written on the breastplate – רבי יוחנן问道: 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 Yisrael* 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).
The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: Any priest who does not speak with Divine Spirit 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 15:27), which is taken to mean that he was removed from the High Priesthood since the Divine Spirit had departed from him.

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.

§ 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.
MISHNA On Yom Kippur, the day on which there is a mitzva by Torah law to afflict oneself, it is prohibited to engage in eating and drinking, and in bathing, and in smearing oil on one’s body, and in wearing shoes, 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 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 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, 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 amoraim debated the nature of a half-measure of a forbidden substance?

HALAKHA Prohibitions for the sake of affliction on Yom Kippur – שִׁיעוּר אֲכִילָה: 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, Orach Hayyim 611:1).

The king and a bride may wash their faces. 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, Hilkhot Shavitat 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, Orach Hayyim 613:10).

The measure of liquid that determines liability for drinking on Yom Kippur – עָנוּשׁ כָּלוּ: One who drinks 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, Orach Hayyim 621:1).

The measure of food that determines liability for eating on Yom Kippur: The measurement is the same as for drinking (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 613:10).

Half-measure – מִצְטָרְפִין: 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, Hilkhot Shavitat Asor 3:1).
This issue is considered a detail of monetary law, and the Torah prohibits even a minute amount of forbidden substance. Reish Lakish said: It is permitted by Torah law. This explanation works well according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan. 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, 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, 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, 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 Yoḥanan 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, 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.

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 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. 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.