

12 Tammuz 5781
June 22, 2021



Yoma Daf 72

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

From where do we know that the robe [had its threads] twelvefold? Because Scripture said: And you shalt make the robe of the ephod braided of techeiles. And one may infer from the analogy of ‘techeiles’, used also in connection with the curtain, just as there [each of the materials had its threads] sixfold, so also sixfold here. But let us infer from the skirt and the pomegranates, just as there it was eightfold thus also here eightfold? — One may infer for one garment from another, but one may not infer for a garment from an adornment to a garment. On the contrary! One may infer concerning a matter from the matter itself, but one may not infer for a thing from something outside of it. For that reason we said: One, to inform us concerning other garments in connection with which ‘shesh’ is not used. (71b5 – 72a1)

The curtain twenty-fourfold. Four [strands of material] each of sixfold [threads], there being here neither judgment nor judge. (72a1)

From where do we know that [each twined thread of] choshen and ephod was twenty-eightfold? Because it is written: And you shall make a choshen of judgment, the work of the skillful workman; like the work of the ephod you shall make it; of gold, of techeiles and purple, and scarlet and fine twined linen — four kinds of material, each sixfold, amount to twenty-four threads, and of the gold, one thread to each of the sixfold threads of the four materials, four [threads], together twenty-eightfold [twine]. Perhaps the gold too was sixfold? — Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: Scripture said: And they [did beat the gold into thin plates and] cut it into threads — that means four.

Rav Ashi said: Scripture states: To work it in the techeiles and in the purple. How should that be done? Shall one make [the gold] four times in twofold, that would amount to eight [fold gold threads]! Shall one make it twice twofold and twice a

one single thread? — Surely the word ‘make’ indicates that all the work in connection with it must be alike! (72a1 – 72a2)

Rechava said in the name of Rav Yehudah: One who makes a tear in priestly vestments incurs lashes, for it is written: *it shall not be torn*.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov asked: Perhaps this is what the Torah was saying: *Make a hem so that it should not be torn*?

The *Gemora* answers: But is it written: “*so that it should not be torn*”? (72a2)

Rabbi Elozar said: One who removes the choshen from the ephod, or one who removes the poles of the Ark incurs lashes, because it is written: *(the choshen) shall not be detached (from the ephod)... and (the poles), they shall not be removed from it*.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov asked: But perhaps this is what the Torah is saying: Fasten them and arrange them well (tightly), so that they “*shall not be detached*,” or that they “*shall not be removed*”?

The *Gemora* answers: Is it written: “*so that they shall not be detached*,” or “*so that they shall not be removed*”? (72a2)

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina pointed out the following contradiction: It is written: *In the rings of the Ark the poles shall be; they shall not be removed from it*, and it is also written: *And its poles shall be put into the rings*. How is that possible? [The first verse indicates immovability, whereas the second implies that they were to be removed and reinserted!]

The *Gemora* answers: They were loose, but could not be removed.

A *braisa* was taught like this as well: *In the rings of the Ark the poles shall be*. One might have thought that they could not be moved from their place (at all); therefore the Torah states: *And its poles shall be put into the rings*. And if the Torah would have written '*and its poles shall be put into*' alone, one might have thought that they were to be removed and reinserted, therefore the Torah states: *In the rings of the Ark the poles shall be*. How is that to be explained? They were loose, but could not be removed. (72a2)

Rabbi Chama the son of Rabbi Chanina said: What is the meaning of the verse: [*You shall make the beams of the Tabernacle of cedar wood, standing?*] It means that they should be stood up, in the manner as they grew (i.e., the part of the tree which was higher while the tree was growing should be higher when the beam was stood up).

Another explanation: "*standing*" — i.e., they supported (the gold) they were plated with.

Another explanation: "*standing*" — one might have thought that (after the Tabernacle was destroyed) their hope (of restoration) is gone and their expectation is ruined; therefore the Torah states: "*standing,*" i.e., standing up forever and ever. (72a3)

Rabbi Chama the son of Rabbi Chanina said: What is the meaning of the verse: *The garments of serad to serve in the Sanctuary* (by covering the vessels while the Mishkan was transported)? If not for the priestly vestments, there would not have remained no remnant or survivor of the enemies of Israel (a euphemism referring to the Jewish people). [This is because these garments were worn during the offering of the sacrifices, which provide atonement for the Jewish people.]

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini said: In the school of Rabbi Shimon a *braisa* was taught: It is referring to the garments

which are cut off from the looms in the shape required, however, a small portion of the unwoven thread was left over.

What is it? Rish Lakish explained: It was (the part of the garment that was produced through) needlework.

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: All priestly vestments must not be made by needlework (sewing), but by weaving, as it is written: *of weaver's work!*?

Abaye said: This applies only to their sleeves, as it was taught in a *braisa*: The sleeves of the priestly vestments were woven separately, and then attached to the garment (thru sewing). They (the sleeves) reached up to the palm of the Kohen's hand. (72a3 – 72b1)

Rechavah said in the name of Rav Yehudah: Three Arks (boxes) did Betzalel make: the middle one of wood, and it was nine *tefachim* (handbreadths) high; the inner one of gold, and it was eight high; the outer one of gold, and it was a little more than ten high.

The *Gemora* asks: But it was taught in a *braisa*: It was a little more than eleven high?

The *Gemora* answers: That is not difficult, for the *braisa* agrees with the view that its thickness (i.e., the bottom of the outside box, as well as the middle one) was one handbreadth (and therefore the outside box needed to be eleven *tefachim* in order to cover the nine *tefachim* of the middle box, plus the one-*tefach* thick *kapores*), whereas the other was in accordance with the view that its thickness was not one handbreadth.

The *Gemora* asks: And what purpose was served by the 'little more'?

The *Gemora* answers: It is the space of the crown (as a decorative rim on the top of the outer box). (72b1)



Rabbi Yochanan said: There were three crowns: that of the altar, that of the ark, and that of the table. The one of the altar Aaron deserved and he received it. The one of the ark, David deserved and received. The one of the ark is still lying and whoever wants to take it, may come and take it. - Perhaps you might think it is of little account, therefore the text reads: By me kings reign.

Rabbi Yochanan pointed out a contradiction. It is written: Zar [stranger] and we read it: zir? i.e., [crown] — If he deserves it, it becomes a crown to him; if not it becomes estranged to him.

Rabbi Yochanan pointed out another contradiction. It is written: Make for yourself an ark of wood, and it is also written: And they shall make an ark of acacia wood? Hence one learns that the inhabitants of his city are obliged to do the work of the scholar for him.

Inside and outside shall you overlay it. Rava said: Any scholar whose inside is not like his outside, is no scholar. Abaye, or, as some say, Rabbah bar Ulla said: He is called abominable, as it is said: How much less one that is abominable and impure, man who drinks iniquity like water.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani, in the name of Rabbi Yonasan: What is the meaning of the scriptural statement: Why is there money in the hand of a fool, to buy wisdom, seeing he has no heart - i.e., woe unto the enemies of the scholars, who occupy themselves with the Torah, but have no fear of heaven! Rabbi Yannai proclaimed: Woe unto him who has no courtyard, but makes a gateway for his courtyard! Rava said to the Sages: I beseech you, do not inherit a double Gehinnom!

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: What is the meaning of the Scriptural verse: And this is the Torah which Moshe set [before the children of Israel]? — If he is meritorious it becomes for him a medicine of life, if not, a deadly poison. That is what Rava [meant when he] said: If he uses it the right

way it is a medicine of life for him; he who does not use it the right way, it is a deadly poison.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani said: Rabbi Yonasan pointed out the following contradiction: it is written: The orders of Hashem are right, rejoicing the heart, but it is also written: The word of Hashem smelts? If he is meritorious, it rejoices him; if not, it smelts him. Rish Lakish said: From the body of the same verse this can be derived: If he is meritorious, it smelts him for life; if not, it smelts him for death.

The fear of Hashem is pure, enduring forever. Rabbi Chanina said: This refers to one who studies the Torah in purity. What does that mean? — He marries a woman and afterwards studies the Torah.

The testimony of Hashem is trustworthy. Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said: It [the Torah] may be entrusted to testify as to those who study it.

The work of an embroider . . . the work of a designer. Rabbi Elazar said: Those embroidered over what they had designed. It was taught in the name of Rabbi Nechemiah: The embroiderer's is needle-work, therefore it has only one [visible] face. The designer's is weaving work, therefore it has two different faces. (72b2 – 72b4)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Breakaway Shul

Currently we have been discussing the correct approach that one should have when engaging in Torah study.

Tosfos poses a contradiction from two different Gemaras. One Gemora implies that one should only study Torah *lishmah*, whereas a different Gemora seems to indicate that one can even engage in Torah study *shelo lishmah*.

Tosfos resolves this discrepancy by explaining that one can only be justified in studying Torah *shelo lishmah* if he is not seeking to aggravate others with his Torah studies. Regarding



one who engages in Torah study for the sake of aggravating others, the Gemora states that it is better had he not even come into existence.

The Netziv in Meishiv Dovor adopts a different approach to resolve this contradiction. The Netziv writes that there are two distinct forms of learning. One manner of learning is when one wishes to render conclusive rulings, and a dissimilar approach is one who engages in Torah study merely for the sake of attaining Torah knowledge. One who is engaged in Torah study with the intention of rendering a conclusive ruling must ensure that he is studying *lishmah*, for the Torah's own sake, as any other motive will lead him to err in halachic rulings.

The Netziv penned this response regarding a Jew who sought to distance himself from a congregation and create his own group of worshippers. When other Jews learned of this man's intentions, they rebuked him for attempting to sow discord in the community. The man who was seeking to create his own prayer group approached the Netziv and explained to the Netziv that he felt justified in his aims, especially since the rabbis frown upon one who commences construction of a new synagogue and abandons his plans halfway through the project. The Netziv responded that when one is engaged in Torah study *shelo lishmah* when attempting to rule in halachic matters, the Torah that he studies does not stand in his merit and it would have been better that he had not come into existence. The rationale for this is that one who engages in Torah study that is not for the sake of Torah is not deemed to have truly studied Torah.

Shelo Lishmah

The Gemora states that if one is meritorious through Torah study, the Torah will be a balm of life for him. If he is not meritorious, however, the Torah will be like poison.

Rav Refoel HaKohen Hamburger writes in his sefer Daas Kedoshim that the term the Gemora uses for meritorious, *zoche*, refers to one who studies Torah *lishmah*, for its own sake.

Rav Hamburger writes further, based on the words of the Rambam in Hilchos Talmud Torah, that the Gemora states that one should always study Torah *shelo lishmah*, because one who studies Torah *shelo lishmah* will eventually study Torah *lishmah*. This is true if one's intention is to ultimately study Torah *lishmah*. When one is young and has just begun to study Torah, he may require an ulterior motive to spur him on in his studies. Upon attaining the degree of studying Torah which is referred to as *lishmah*, the Torah that he studies is a balm of life. When one does not succeed in studying Torah *lishmah*, then his Torah study is akin to poison.

The Sefer HaChinuch in mitzvah fourteen, however, appears to maintain that even one who studies Torah *shelo lishmah*, without the intention of ever studying Torah *lishmah*, will be effected by his Torah study and he ultimately will attain the level of studying Torah *lishmah*. The Chinuch posits that this is analogous to one who collects taxes illegally on behalf of the king. Eventually, such a person will transform into a thief, as his actions will influence him negatively. Conversely, if one performs positive actions, albeit for the wrong reasons, he will ultimately be influenced to perform those actions altruistically.

DAILY MASHAL

Talmid Chacham Compared to the Aron

The Gemora learns from the fact that the aron was coated with gold on the outside and the inside that a talmid chochom should be the same. His inside should be as pure as his outside. The Hafloaa in Ponim Yofos comments that the comparison to the aron eludes to the learning of Torah '*lishmah*'. The aron was pure gold on the outside and inside, yet the middle was wood. A person when he begins learning should try to learn '*lishmah*', however when he sees that there are difficulties and stumbling blocks to this endeavor, he must adept and perhaps will be successful if he learns '*shelo lishmah*', providing that his goal is to 'reach for the gold' and eventually learn purely '*lishmah*'.