

13 Tammuz 5781
June 23, 2021



Yoma Daf 73

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

The *Mishnah* had stated: In these (eight vestments) were the *urim vetumim* inquired of.

When Rav Dimi came (from Eretz Yisroel) he said: In the vestments which the Kohen Gadol officiates with, the Kohen Anointed for Battle officiates with, as it is written: *And the holy vestments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him, i.e., for him who comes after him in greatness.*

Rav Adda bar Ahavah, and some say that it was asked without attribution, asked from a *Baraisa*: One might have thought that the son of the Kohen Anointed for Battle succeeds him in service (after his death), just as the son of the Kohen Gadol succeeds him in service; therefore the Torah states: *Seven days shall the son that is serving in his stead put them on - he who will enter into the Tent of Meeting.* This means: he who is worthy of entering the Tent of Meeting (the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur). [This would exclude the Kohen Anointed for Battle.] Now, if this were the case (that the Kohen Anointed for Battle serves with eight vestments), then he too would be fit (to enter the Tent of Meeting)?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: This is what it means: Whosoever was mainly anointed for the purpose of serving in the Tent of Meeting (passes on the service to his son). This excludes one who was anointed mainly for battle.

The Gemora asks from a *Baraisa*: The Kohen Anointed for Battle officiates neither in four vestments, like a common Kohen, nor in eight like a Kohen Gadol.?

Abaye said: Would you render him then a non-Kohen?

Rather, it meant as follows: He (Rabbinically) does not serve like a Kohen Gadol (with eight vestments), for the sake of enmity (although on a Biblical level, he may serve while wearing the eight vestments), nor like a common Kohen, because in sacred matters, one elevates, but one must not degrade.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah said to Rava: But there is a Tanna who pays no attention to the principle of enmity, yet, according to him, he still does not officiate (wearing eight vestments); for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: The things which distinguish a *Kohen Gadol* from an ordinary *Kohen* are the following: The bull that is offered for all the commandments, and the bull of *Yom Kippur*, and the tenth of the *eifah*; he (*the Kohen Gadol*) must neither let his hair grow long nor may he rend his garments (*as a display of mourning*), but he may rend them from below while the ordinary *Kohen* tears them from above; he must not defile himself for deceased relatives (*by coming in contact with them*); he is obligated to marry a virgin and is forbidden to marry a widow; he (*by dying*) enables the unintentional murderer to return to his home; he may offer *korbanos* even while an *onein* (*one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet*), though he may not then eat of any sacrificial meat or take a portion of it; he offers up his portion first and receives his portion first; he serves in eight vestments, and the entire service of *Yom Kippur* may be performed by him alone; and he is also exempt from bringing a sacrifice for an inadvertent transgression of *tumah* relating to the Temple and its consecrated things.

The *Baraisa* continues: And all these laws are applicable to the *Kohen Gadol* of additional vestments, with the exception of the bull that is offered for all the commandments. All these

laws, furthermore, are also applicable to an anointed *Kohen Gadol* who (*having acted as a substitute*) has retired from service, with the exception of the bull of *Yom Kippur* and the tenth of the *eifah*. All these laws do not apply to a *Kohen Gadol* anointed for battle, with the exception of the five things that are specified in the Biblical passage (*dealing with the Kohen Gadol*): He may not let his hair grow long nor may he rend his garments, he must not defile himself for deceased relatives, he is obligated to marry a virgin and forbidden to marry a widow, and enables the unintentional murderer to return to his home; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. But the Sages said: He does not enable the unintentional murderer to return to his home. Now, where does he (the Tanna) consider (the concern of) enmity; it is only with regard to one of similar rank, but with one who is inferior to him (such as the Kohen Anointed for Battle), he does consider it.

Rabbi Avahu was sitting and reporting this teaching in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, whereupon Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi averted their faces (indicating that they disapproved).

The *Gemora* notes: Others say it was Rabbi Chiya bar Abba who reported this teaching, whereupon Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi averted their faces.

Rav Pappa asked: Granted (that they could not say anything directly against) Rabbi Avahu, because of the high esteem the house of the Caesar had for him, but as for Rabbi Chiya bar Abba, they should have told him explicitly that Rabbi Yochanan had not said so!?

When Ravin came, he said: This (that the Kohen Anointed for Battle wears eight vestments) was stated with reference to the time when he is consulted (to enquire of the Urim veTumim).

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa* in support of this: The vestments which the Kohen Gadol wears when he officiates, the Kohen Anointed for Battle wears when he is consulted. (72b4 – 73a3)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: How was it (the *Urim Vetumim*) consulted? The inquirer (either the king or the head of Sanhedrin) had his face directed to the one who was consulted (the Kohen Gadol), and the one being consulted directed himself to the Divine Presence. The inquirer said: *Shall I pursue after this troop?* He who was consulted answered: *So says Hashem: Go up and succeed!* Rabbi Yehudah said: He does not need to say: *So says Hashem*, but only: *Go up and succeed!*

The *Baraisa* continues: One does not inquire in a loud voice, as it is written: *And he shall inquire of him*; neither shall one think the question in one's heart, as it is written: *And he shall inquire ... before Hashem*. Rather, he inquires in the manner in which Channah spoke in her prayer, as it is written: *Now Channah, she was speaking in her heart*.

The *Baraisa* continues: One should not ask two questions at the same time; if one has done so, only one (question) is answered; and only the first (question) is answered, as it is written: *Will the leaders of Ke'ilah deliver me into his hand? Will Shaul come down, etc.*, and Hashem said: *He will come down*.

The *Gemora* asks: But you said: Only the first (question) is answered (and here, it is the second question that was answered)?

The *Gemora* answers: David had asked them in the incorrect order, and received his answer in the correct order.

The *Gemora* notes: And as soon as he knew that he had asked in the incorrect order, he asked again in the correct order, as it is written: *Will the leaders of Ke'ilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Shaul?* And Hashem said: *They will deliver*.

The *Baraisa* continues: But if both questions are urgent, both were answered, as it is written: *And David inquired of Hashem, saying: Shall I pursue after this troop? Will I overtake them? And He answered him: pursue; for you shall*

surely overtake them and you shall surely rescue. And although the decree of a prophet could be withdrawn, the decree of the *Urim Vetumim* could not be withdrawn, as it is written: *By the judgment of the Urim.*

The Gemora asks: Why were they called *Urim Vetumim*?

The Gemora answers: *Urim* because they made their words enlightening; *Vetumim* because they fulfill their words. And if you should ask: Why did they not fulfill their words in Givas Binyamin (for the tribes wished to execute the perpetrators from Binyamin who violated a concubine of a man and caused her death; they asked the *Urim Vetumim* and the answer was to go ahead and fight Binyamin, but they suffered casualties; this happened again a second time; they were only successful on the third time)? It was because they did not inquire whether the result would be victory or defeat. But at last (the third time), when they asked (if they would succeed or not), they (the *Urim Vetumim*) approved their action, as it is written: *And Pinchas, the son of Elozar, the son of Aaron, stood before it (the Ark) in those days, saying: Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Binyamin my brother, or shall I cease? And Hashem said: Go up, for tomorrow, I will deliver them into your hands.*

The Gemora explains how the *Urim Vetumim* answered: Rabbi Yochanan said: The letters stood out (i.e., those letters which protruded spelled out a certain word). Rish Lakish said: They joined each other.

The Gemora asks: But the letter 'tzadi' was missing (from the names of the tribes)?

Rav Shmuel bar Yitzchak said: They contained also the names of Avraham, Yitzchak and Yaakov.

The Gemora asks: But the 'tes,' as well, was missing?

Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: They contained also the words: The 'tribes' of Yeshurun.

The Gemora asks from a Baraisa: No Kohen was inquired of who does not speak by means of the Divine Spirit and upon whom the Divine Presence does not rest, for Tzadok inquired and succeeded, while Evyasar inquired and failed, as it is written: *But Evyasar went up until all the people had done passing out of the city?* [Evidently, the Kohen was needed to interpret the answer.]

The Gemora answers: He helped along (i.e., the *Urim Vetumim* was effective only when the Kohen was worthy).

The Mishnah had stated: And one inquired only for a king.

The Gemora asks: From where do we know these things?

Rabbi Avahu said: It is written: *And he shall stand before Elozar the Kohen, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim; 'he' i.e., the king, 'and all the children of Israel with him', i.e., the Kohen Anointed for Battle; 'and all the congregation' - that is the Sanhedrin. (73a3 – 73b3)*

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, BA LO

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Urim Vetumim

The Gemora states the format and the position of the kohen gadol when a question is being asked to the *Urim V'Tumim*. There seems to be two arguments between Rashi and the Rambam. Rashi holds that the asker (the king) and the kohen were facing each other and the kohen's face was turned towards the choshen which encased the *Urim V'tumim*. The Rambam holds that the kohen was facing the aron and the asker faced the back of the kohen. Another argument pertains to the voice of the one asking. The Rambam holds that nobody else should hear him, similar to the way we daven and that is the proof of the Gemora to this form the tefillah of Chanah. Rashi, however (Tosfos Yeshonim is explicit regarding this) that the kohen hears the question which is being asked.

The sefer Imrei Chein explains these opinions. They are arguing as to who is the nishal - to whom are we asking the question. Rashi holds we are asking the kohen gadol and that is why the asker faces him and that explains why he must hear the question. Rambam disagrees and holds that the question is to the Shechina. The kohen is only a conduit to the Ribono Shel Olam. This is why they both are facing the aron, the place where the Shechina resides and this explains why the kohen does not have to hear the question.

Look in Ibn Ezra in Parshas Pinchos where the Torah informs us of the asking of the Urim V'Tumim and he says two explanations in the words of the passuk 'al piv yetzu'. One psbat is by the mouth of Elozar HaKohen through the Urim V'Tumim and his second explanation is by the words of the Urim V'Tumim. The two explanations are based on what we explained before.

According to this, perhaps we can explain a Gemora in Temurah. The Gemora relates that in the days when Klal Yisroel were mourning the loss of Moshe Rabbeinu, three thousand halochos were forgotten. They went to Yehoshua and Elozar (and others) and said "Go ask from Hashem these halachos." There were two responses given. One was that a prophet does not have permission to create new laws and a second answer to them was that Torah cannot be found in the heaven. What is the significance of these two responses?

The Brisker Rov asks on how would they have asked Hashem anyway? Moshe was the only one who had a direct channel to Hashem. They couldn't speak to Hashem whenever they wanted? He answers that the Gemora means that they would ask by utilizing the Urim V'Tumim.

We now can understand the two responses of the Gemora (bderech drush ktzas), based on the two explanations of the Urim V'Tumim. If the question was asked to the Ribono Shel Olam and the kohen is only a conduit, the response that was given to Klal Yisroel at that time was Torah cannot be found in the heavens. A halachic shaila cannot be answered using

the Urim V'Tumim. If the question was asked to the kohen and he would answer using the Urim V'Tumim, his response was that a prophet cannot create new halachos and therefore he doesn't have the power to return those halachos that were forgotten.

DAILY MASHAL

"Es ho'urim v'es hatumim" - The Mechilta parshas Mishpotim #15 says that we do not ask the "urim v'tumim" to give us a halachic decision. Rashi on the gemara Eiruvin 45a d.h. "ha'rei" says the same. This is clearly indicated in the gemara T'muroh 16a, which says that 3,000 halochos were forgotten during the mourning period after the death of Moshe. The gemara says that to recover them through heavenly communication is not allowed, "lo bashomayim hee." It seems that this is not an impenetrable rule. The Rshash points out that Rashi himself on the gemara Eiruvin 63a d.h. "dich'siv" writes that Yehoshua asked Elozor a halachic question. This is understood by the Rshash as a question to be answered by the "urim v'tumim" as otherwise Yehoshua would not have gone specifically to Elozor. The Rosh on our verse writes that the "urim v'tumim" would not answer something that could be answered by a person. Tosfos on the gemara Gitin 68a d.h. "iko" says the same as the Rosh. Perhaps Yehoshua had no other option. (Medrash Halacha)