

11 Tammuz 5781
June 21, 2021



Yoma Daf 71

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

Order of the verses

The Mishnah said that the Kohen Gadol then went in to the Holy of Holies to sanctify his hands and feet (and, while wearing the white garments, take out the ladle and coal-pan.

The Gemora cites a Baraisa which says that the verse which says Aharon will come into the Tent of Meeting teaches that he must enter to take out the ladle and coal-pan *after* he offers his ram and the nation's ram, even though it is written out of order, making it the only verse in this section which is out of order.

What is the reason for this? Rav Chisda explains that it must be out of order, since we know that the Kohen Gadol must immerse five times and wash his hands and feet 10 times, and if the verse is in order, he would only need to immerse three times and wash his hands and feet six times.

Rabbi Zeira asks: Why don't we say instead that he interrupts between the two services in linen to offer the outer he-goat, and leave this verse in order?

Abaye answers that the next verse says that he will exit the Tent of Meeting and then offer his [and the nation's olah], teaching that he offers them right after he exits the first time (and not after he takes out the ladle and coal-pan). (70b3 – 71a1)

Rava says that we must say this verse is out of order, since the end of the verse says that he will take off the linen clothes, *which he wore* when entering the Tent of Meeting. The phrase *which he wore* is extra, since he obviously will take off what he wore, and it therefore teaches that he

already wore them once before, indicating that he wears the linen clothes a second time to retrieve the ladle and coal-pan.

Rabbah bar Shaila challenges this, as we can still leave the verse in order, but say that he interrupted the two entries with the outer goat, and the Gemora again answers that the verse states that as soon as he exits the first time, he offers the rams. (71a1 – 71a2)

The Gemora challenges the statement that all the other verses *are* in order. One verse says that he will offer the fats of the chatas on the altar, and the next one says that he will take the chatas bull and goat outside and burn them, yet the Mishnah had stated: He who sees the Kohen Gadol when he reads does not see the bull and the he-goat that are being burnt (because the distance apart was great and both services were performed at the same time), and the sacrificial parts of the chatas were burned only afterwards!?

The Gemora therefore amends the Baraisa to say that from this verse on, the order is inaccurate.

The Gemora asks as to why we prefer to adjust the ordering of the verses, as opposed to saying that the Mishnah's order is inaccurate.

Abaye answers that the verses themselves indicate that they are out of order, since the verses after the offering of the fats say “and the one who sent the goat [to azazel] will wash his clothes” and “and the one that burned the chatas's will wash his clothes.” [In both instances, the same expression, “and the one that” is used.] Just as the verse about the one who sent the goat refers to something that already happened, so does the one about the one who burned the chatas.

The Gemora ask: On the contrary! Why don't we say instead that just as the verse about the one who burned is referring to burning *after* the offering of the fats, so too the verse about the one who sent the goat is referring to sending it *afterwards*?

The Gemora answers that the phrase “and the one who sent” itself implies that he did it earlier.

Rava answers that the verse says that the goat for azazel will be kept alive, to atone, teaching that it only must be alive until the atonement of the other goat, i.e., the application of its blood, which happens before offering the chatas fats. (71a2 – 71a3)

Greeting the Kohen Gadol

The Gemora says that if the one who sent the goat to azazel meets the Kohen Gadol after Yom Kippur in public, he tells him, “My master, Kohen Gadol, I have fulfilled your mission,” but if he meets him at home, he tells him, “We have fulfilled the mission of Hashem, who provides life to the living.”

Rabbah says that when the Sages in Pumbedisa would take leave of each other, they would bless each other, “May Hashem, who provides life to the living, give you a long, good, and full life.”

Rav Yehudah explains that the verse which says that I will walk in front of Hashem in the land of the living refers to a marketplace, which has all of a person's needs for life.

Rabbi Elozar explains that the verse which states that Hashem will lengthen for you days and years of life refers not just to life (as the years a person lives are always of life), but rather to one whose fortunes turn from bad to good, which is akin to resurrection. (71a3 – 71a4)

Rabbi Berechiah explains the following verses:

1. I call out to you, *ishim – men*: refers to Torah scholars, who are meek like women (*isha*), but show strength in Torah learning like men.
2. If one desires to offer wine libations on the altar, he should provide wine to Torah scholars, as the verse refers to them as *ishim – fire offerings*.
3. If one sees that his children are not learning Torah, he should marry them to the daughter of a Torah scholar, as the verse says that if one sees that his root is getting old in the ground, and his stump is dying in the dust (i.e., he is aging, and his children are not learning), he will sprout and produce from the smell of water (i.e., Torah). (71a4 – 71b1)

The celebration of the Kohen Gadol

The Mishnah said that the Kohen Gadol would make a celebration for his friends when he exited the Tent of Meeting safely.

The Gemora cites a Baraisa which tells the story of a Kohen Gadol who left the Bais Hamikdash with a large procession following him. When the crowd saw Shemaya and Avtalyon, the Torah leaders, they left him to follow them. When Shemaya and Avtalyon took leave of the Kohen Gadol, he told them that they, the son of the nations (i.e., non-Jews) should go to peace (deriding to the fact that they were descendants of converts). They responded that they, the sons of the nations, should go to peace, as they follow in the path of Aharon, who spread peace, while he, the son of Aharon, should not go to peace, as he doesn't follow in Aharon's path. (71b1)

The kohen's garments

The Mishnah says that the Kohen Gadol serves wearing 8 clothes, while the regular kohanim wear only 4 – the kesones (white tunic), michnasayim (pants), mitznefes (hat), and avnet (belt). The Kohen Gadol's additional 4 are the choshen (breastplate), efod (apron), me'il (blue tunic), and tzitz (head plate). With these 8 garments they can consult the urim v'tumim for guidance, but even then, only for a king, head of



the court, or anyone else the community needs. (71b1 – 71b2)

The Gemora cites a Baraisa which details the thickness of the different threads used in the Tent of Meeting and the kohen's garments:

- Anything that is called *shesh* – linen were woven from threads of 6 strands.
- Anything called *mashzar* – spun (i.e., the pomegranates on the me'il) was woven from threads of 8 strands.
- The me'il was made from threads of 12 strands.
- The paroches was made from threads of 24 strands.
- The choshen and efod were made from thread of 28 strands.

The Gemora explains the source for these statements.

1. Shesh: The Gemora says there are five verses that use the word shesh (kesones, mitznefes, migba'os (of the regular kohanim), pants).

These are used:

1. for its literal meaning, i.e., linen.
2. for the meaning of 6, i.e., 6 strands.
3. to teach that the strands should be spun into one thread.
4. to teach about the other garments, beyond the ones enumerated here.
5. to make any garment without such threads invalid. (71b2 – 71b3)

The Gemora asks: How do we know that shesh means linen? Rabbi Yossi the son of Rabbi Chanina says that the word *bad* used along with *shesh* means linen, since it is taken from the ground *bad bad* – as individual stalks with strands in them. The Gemora asks as to why we don't say it is wool, as that also grows as individual hairs, and answers that the hairs split. Even though linen also splits, it only does so when beaten in processing. Ravina answers that we learn the meaning of shesh from the verse in Yechezkel which state that the kohanim will wear hats and pants of linen. Rav Ashi challenges this, as how did we know what it was before the

times of Yechezkel. The Gemora deflects this, as we also only know that an apostate may not serve in the Bais Hamikdash from a verse in Yechezkel. In both cases we must say that these were known through a tradition, until Yechezkel provided a verse to base them on. (71b3 – 71b4)

2. Mashzar: The Gemora says that we learn from the common word *mashzar* used in reference to the pomegranates and in reference to the paroches that the total number of strands in both is 24. Since there are only three types of threads in the pomegranates (blue, purple, and red), each must be of 8 strands.

The Gemora asks as to why we don't learn from the same word used in reference to the choshen and efod, which were 28 strands in total, and answers that the pomegranates and paroches had no gold, unlike the choshen and efod. The Gemora rejects this, as both the pomegranates and the choshen and efod are garments, unlike the paroches, which was part of the Tent of Meeting. Rather, the Gemora says that we learn from the same word used in reference to the avnet, which is also a garment that doesn't have gold.

Rav Mari answers that the verse about the choshen says you shall make *it*, excluding others from a comparison.

Rav Ashi answers that the verse about the pomegranates says “and you shall make”, teaching that each of its threads must be equivalent. Since there are three types of threads, the total cannot be 28, since it's not evenly divisible by 3. (71b4 – 71b5)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF ***Kesones was Shatnez***

It is stated in the Mishnah that the Kohen Gadol wears eight begodim and the kohen hedyot dons four. The Yerushalmi comments that each one of the kohen's clothing served as an atonement for a specific aveira. The shirt is a forgiveness for the transgression of wearing shatnez (wool and linen together). The commentators on Midrash explain the

connection between the shirt and shatnez because the shirt itself was shatnez. This is extremely bewildering for it is explicit that the shirt of the kohen was made solely from linen and there was no wool in it?

There is a famous answer given based on a riling of the Rama. He rules that one is forbidden to wear shoes of linen and socks from wool, even though they are two different articles. The reason for this is because it is considered like one since the socks cannot be removed without first taking off the shoes. The same can be said regarding the kohen's shirt. The Kohen Gadol wore the robe on top of the shirt and the robe was made from wool. Since the shirt could not be removed without first taking off the robe, this can be considered shatnez.

There are those that say that this can be the reason why the Kohen Gadol puts the headplate (tzitz) on last. In truth, he can lift his hands in the air and wiggle out of the shirt without removing the robe. However, there is a halacha that he cannot lift his hands higher than the tzitz because it has Hashem's name inscribed on it. It comes out that the wearing of the tzitz is what creates the shatnez of the shirt and the robe, hence we delay the placing of the tzitz until the end.

Out of Order

The Gemora states that all the pesukim which are written in the Torah regarding the avodah on Yom Kippur are written in their precise order and must be adhered to except for the possuk which refers to the removal of the ladle and coal-pan from the Kodesh Kodoshim. This is written together with the other avodos that were done with the bigdei lovon, while in truth, the Kohen Gadol would first change to the golden clothes and later don a new set of bigdei lovon to enter the Kodesh Kodoshim and remove these two utensils.

Rav Chisda explains the reasoning for this. There is a halacha l'Moshe misinai dictating that the Kohen Gadol must immerse himself in the mikvah five times on Yom Kippur. He did that every time he changed clothing. If there wasn't this

additional changing, he would be immersing only three times.

The Chachmas Adam brings from the Vilna Gaon that it would seem odd that the Torah wrote it in this manner and not according to the correct sequence. The Gaon states that it is correct. It is written in Midrash that Aharon was able to enter the Kodesh Kodoshim whenever he wanted (even not on Yom Kippur), providing that he would enter in the same fashion and bring the exact korbonos as Yom Kippur. The Gaon proposes that during the rest of the year, he would do the avodos according to the precise order of the pesukim for there is no halacha l'Moshe misinai that five immersions are required on those days.

There is a question in the mefarshim if other kohanim gedolim (besides Aharon) were permitted to enter in this manner, as well.

Out of Order - # 2

It is stated in Tosefta that any avodah on Yom Kippur which is done in an imprecise order is deemed invalid except for the removal of ladle and the firepan from the Kodesh Kodoshim. If this was done in the wrong order, it is still valid. The Brisker Rov explains that this is because it is written in the wrong order in the Torah. The only reason it is switched is because of the halacha l'Moshe misinai that there must be five immersions by the Kohen Gadol and hence five changing of clothes. However, it is not included in the 'seder' of the avodos of Yom Kippur.

The Mikdash Dovid posits a simpler reason. If he removed the utensils from the Kodesh Kodoshim in the wrong order, what can possibly be done. It is impossible to correct. What was done was done. There is no option to remove it again.