

4 Iyar 5781
April 16, 2021



Yoma Daf 5

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

1. The difference between them is semichah.

The Gemara asks: What is the difference between them (Rabbi Yochanan and Rabbi Chanina)? Rav Yosef said: Semichah (the leaning of the hands on the head of the offering) is the difference between them. According to the one (Rabbi Yochanan) who maintains that everything that was written regarding the *miluim* service is essential for them, then semichah is essential; and according to the one (Rabbi Chanina) who maintains that something that is not essential for future generations is not essential for them, semichah is not essential. And how is it known that semichah is not essential for future generations? For it was taught in a Baraisa: it is said *and he shall lean his hand upon the head of an olah, and acceptance shall be gained for him, to atone for him*. Is *semichah* that which atones; why one only gains atonement when the blood of the sacrifice is thrown, as it is said *for it is the blood that, through the soul, atones?* When it is said *and he shall lean..... and acceptance shall be gained*, it means that if one views *semichah* as the residue of a mitzvah, which means that he does not view *semichah* as an actual commandment, and he did not do the semichah, it is considered as if it did not effect atonement, although in reality it did effect atonement.¹ (5a1)

2. The difference between them is tenufah.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said that *tenufah*² is the difference between them. According to the one (Rabbi

Yochanan) who maintains that everything that was written regarding the *miluim* service is essential for them, then tenufah is essential; and according to the one (Rabbi Chanina) who maintains that something that is not essential for future generations is not essential for them, tenufah is not essential. And how is it known that tenufah is not essential for future generations? For it was taught in a Baraisa: the verse states regarding a poor metzora *then he shall take one male lamb as an asham for waving, to effect atonement*. Is *tenufah* that which atones; why one only gains atonement when the blood of the sacrifice is thrown, as it is said *for it is the blood that, through the soul, atones?* When it is said *for waving, to effect atonement*, it means that if one viewed waving as the residue of the mitzvah and he did not do it, it is considered as if it did not effect atonement, although in reality it did effect atonement. (5a1)

3. The difference between them is sequestering.

Rav Pappa says that the difference between them is the requirement that the Kohen Gadol be sequestered for the first seven days of the *miluim* period to prepare for his service on the eighth day. According to Rabbi Yochanan, who maintains that everything written regarding them is essential for them, then sequestering is essential for the Kohen Gadol during the *miluim* period, whereas according to Rabbi Chanina who maintains that something that is not essential for future generations is not essential for them, then sequestering

¹ This means that although one does gain atonement for his transgression through the sacrifice, he has not fulfilled the commandment of HaShem in the best possible manner.

² There were certain offerings that were waved in the Courtyard of the Bais HaMikdash. An example of this is the *shelamim*,

whose breast and right thigh are removed from the rest of the meat and waved along with the other sacrificial parts that will be burned on the mizbeiach. The waving is referred to as *tenufah*, where the owner of the offering and the Kohen wave the parts to and fro and up and down.



is not essential. And how is it known that sequestering is not essential for future generations? It is because our Mishnah taught that they *prepare* another Kohen as his substitute and the Mishnah did not teach that they *sequester* another Kohen.³ (5a1)

4. A Kohen Gadol can serve even if he has not served with the eight vestments for seven consecutive days.

Ravina says that the difference between them is regarding the addition of vestments for seven days and anointment with oil for seven days. According to the one (Rabbi Yochanan) who maintains that everything that was written regarding the *miluim* service is essential for them, then the addition of vestments for seven days and anointment with oil for seven days is essential; and according to the one (Rabbi Chanina) who maintains that something that is not essential for future generations is not essential for them, the addition of vestments for seven days and anointment with oil for seven days is not essential. And how is it known that the addition of vestments for seven days and anointment with oil for seven days is not essential for future generations? For it was taught in a Baraisa: it is said regarding the Yom Kippur service *and the Kohen who has been anointed or who has been inaugurated to serve in place of his father shall effect atonement*. It is said elsewhere regarding the inauguration of a new Kohen Gadol *for a seven-day period he shall don the vestments-he who serves in his stead [the previous Kohen Gadol's] among his sons*. If he had the vestments added to him for seven days and he was anointed for seven days, then he can serve as Kohen Gadol in place of his father. If the vestments were added to him for seven days and he was only anointed for one day, or if the vestments were added to him for one day and he was anointed for seven days, he can also serve. This is derived from the words *who has been anointed or*

who has been inaugurated, which implies that the Kohen Gadol is not required to add the extra vestments and be anointed for seven days to serve as a qualified Kohen Gadol. (5a1 - 5a2)

5. Anointment of seven days is required for the Kohen Gadol in future generations.

From the verse that states *for a seven-day period he shall don them* we learn that adding the vestments of the Kohen Gadol for seven days is required initially. We know that initially there is a requirement of anointment for seven days because the Torah had to state that seven days of anointing are not essential, so the implication is that initially the Kohen Gadol must be anointed for seven days. Alternatively, we derive this law from the verse that states *and the holy vestments that are for Aharon shall be to his sons after him, to become elevated (literally: anointed) with them and to become inaugurated through them*. Since the word *lemashchah, to anoint*, is said regarding the donning of vestments, we learn that anointing is likened to adding vestments. Just like adding the vestments is for seven days, so too the anointment is for seven days. (5a2)

6. There are three sources for something that was not written regarding the miluim but was essential to the service.

What is the reason of the one who says that everything written concerning them is essential? Rabbi Yitzchak bar Bisna said: It is said *and you shall do to Aharon and his sons so*, and the word *so* implies that everything written regarding the *miluim* is essential. The Gemara asks: This only teaches us that anything that is written in the section where the word *so* is written is essential, but how do we know something that is not written in this section? Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that it is derived by employing a *gezeirah shavah* using the words *entrance, entrance* that is written in each section.⁴ Rav

³ This is clear proof that the requirement to sequester the Kohen Gadol is not essential to the Yom Kippur service.

⁴ In one instance it is said *and Aharon and his sons you shall bring near to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting*. Elsewhere it is said

and gather the entire assembly to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting. Following that verse it is said *cook the meat at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting*. The term *entrance* mentioned

Mesharshiya said that it is derived from the end of the section regarding the *miluim* service where it is said *and you shall protect HaShem's charge*, which implies that every detail must be performed. Rav Ashi said that it is because it is said *for so have I been commanded*, which implies essentiality. (5a2 - 5b1)

7. Aharon and his sons ate the Minchah even though they were in a state of *aninus*.

The Gemara cites a Baraisa: [On the eighth day of the *miluim* period, the two sons of Aharon, Nadav and Avihu, died, which placed Aharon and his two remaining sons, Elazar and Isamar, in a state of *aninus*, which is the state of mourning that commences as soon as one of the seven closest relatives dies. Moshe then commanded Aharon and his sons to eat the Minchah, despite the fact that Aharon and his sons were in a state of *aninus*.] It is written: *for so I have been commanded; as I had commanded; as Hashem has commanded. For so I have been commanded* – they should eat the Minchah, despite the fact that Aharon and his sons were in a state of *aninus*.⁵ *As I had commanded* – Moshe told him at the time of the incident.⁶ *As Hashem has commanded* – and it is not on my own that I said (to eat the shelamim offering, for my mistake was only regarding the chatas, but not regarding the shelamim). (5b1)

8. The pants of the Kohanim and the tenth-ephah were included in the *miluim* service.

[Moshe was instructed to dress Aharon and his sons in their required vestments on each of the seven days of the *miluim*.] Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina said: The Torah does not mention that Aharon and his sons should wear pants. When the Torah states in its introduction to the commandment regarding the *miluim* service *and this is*

the matter that you shall do for them to sanctify them to serve as Kohanim, the word *and* is considered to be adding to the preceding section where the pants of the Kohanim are mentioned. This teaches that the pants were part of the vestments that Aharon and his sons were required to wear during the *miluim* period. The tenth-*ephah*, which was the Minchah offering that every Kohen brought on his inauguration, was also brought by Aharon and his sons during the *miluim* period. The Gemara asks: That we derive the requirement for the pants is understood, for this verse is written in the topic of the vestments, but how do we know regarding the tenth-*ephah*? This is derived from a *gezeirah shavah* using the word *this*. Regarding the *miluim* it is said *and this is the matter...* and regarding the commandment that every Kohen must offer a Minchah offering the first time he performs the service in the Bais HaMikdash, it is said *this is the offering of Aharon and his sons which each shall offer to HaShem on the day he is inaugurated; a tenth of an ephah*. The *gezeirah shavah* links that Minchah with the *miluim* service. (5b2)

9. The reading of the Scriptural section was essential for the *miluim* service.

Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai: Prior to performing the *miluim* service, Moshe gathered the Jewish People at the entrance of the Mishkan and said to them *this is the thing that HaShem commanded to do*. The Gemara understands this verse to mean that before beginning the *miluim* service, Moshe read to the Jewish People the instructions that he had received from HaShem regarding the *miluim* service. The usage of the word *davar*, word, teaches us that even

in both verses is the link between the two sections and it teaches that everything in both sections is essential.

⁵ Although an *onein* is normally prohibited from eating sacrificial foods, this case was an exception, so Moshe had to state explicitly that he was thus commanded by HaShem.

⁶ When Moshe realized that the chatas-offering was burned and not eaten, he became angry with Aaron and his sons, for he

thought that it should be eaten just as the commandment was to eat the Minchah. In fact, this was a mistake, as it was only the Minchah which would override the prohibition of eating in a state of *aninus*, for that was a special offering for that moment of the Inauguration, unlike the chatas, which was a common sacrifice for all generations.

the *dibbur*, the speech, was essential to the *miluim* service. (5b2)

10. There is a dispute regarding how Moshe dressed Aharon and his sons.

The Gemara wonders how Moshe dressed Aharon and his sons. — What is past, is past! Rather, [the question is] in what order will he put the garments on them in the future? — In the future, too, when Aharon and his sons will come, Moshe will come with them. Rather, the purpose of knowing this information is to resolve a contradiction in verses. [In one instance it is said *you shall girdle them with a belt, Aharon and his sons*. This implies that Moshe dressed Aharon and his sons simultaneously i.e. he dressed Aharon in all his vestments except for the belt, and then he dressed Aharon's sons in all their vestments except for their belts. Moshe then placed the belts on Aharon and his sons. However, at the time of the actual performance, it is said that Moshe dressed Aharon with all his vestments, including his belt, and then he dressed Aharon's sons in all their vestments, including their belts.] The sons of Rabbi Chiya and Rabbi Yochanan held different opinions about it. One said: Aharon was first clothed and afterwards his sons; while the other said: Aharon and his sons were clothed simultaneously. Said Abaye: With regard to the tunic and the turban no one disagrees the fact that Aharon came first and his sons afterwards, for both in the [text containing] the command and [the account of the] actual performance Aharon is mentioned first. What they are disputing is [the order of] the belt. He who says Aharon [came first] and then his sons [is of this opinion] because it is written: And he girded him with the belt, and only after this is it written, And he girded them with a belt, whereas he who holds that the girding took place without any interruption, [is of this opinion] because it is written, And you shalt gird them with belts, Aharon and his sons. According to the opinion that Aharon and his sons were girded at the same time, doesn't Scripture first say, 'And he girded him with a belt' and then only later is it written, 'And he girded them with a belt'? — He will tell you: This is to teach you that the

belt of the Kohen Gadol was not the same [material] as that of the average Kohen. According to the opinion that Aharon was girded and afterwards his sons, doesn't Scripture say, 'And you shalt gird them with a belt'? - He will tell you this informs us that the belt of the Kohen Gadol was of the same [material] as the average Kohen. Was it then necessary to state: 'And he girded him with a belt' and [then] 'And he girded them'? From that we infer that Aharon came first and then his sons. But how could it have been possible simultaneously? — This only means to indicate that [Aharon] came first. (5b2 – 6a1)

DAILY MASHAL

Resurrection of the Dead is obvious

The Gemara poses a question regarding the future when Aharon and his sons come back to life, and Moshe will be with them, how will Moshe dress Aharon and his sons?

It is interesting to note that the Gemara takes it for granted that Moshe, Aharon and his sons will all be resurrected in the future. Resurrection of the Dead is one of the Rambam's thirteen principles of faith. An examination of Chelek, the last Perek of Sanhedrin, where the Gemara expounds on Scriptural proofs that there will be a Resurrection of the Dead, indicates that the essence of this belief is based on the Chachamim's interpretations of Scripture. It follows, then, that once it has been proven that there will be a resurrection, the Gemara can safely say that Moshe, Aharon and his sons will come back to life. This historical footnote should be taken seriously, as the Gemara in Chelek states that one who denies the principle of the Resurrection of the Dead will not merit being resurrected. Belief in this principle is critical for our future existence.