

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Removing the shovel and ladle (cont.)

The Gemara concludes citing a Baraisa that discusses the service of removing the shovel and ladle from the Kodosh Kodoshim.

R' Chisda explains why the Baraisa assumes that one of the verses is out of order.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava offers an alternative explanation how the Baraisa knows that the verse (Vayikra 16:23) is out of order.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The assertion of the Baraisa that all the verses except one are in order is successfully challenged. The Gemara, therefore explains that all the verses up until verse כ"ג are in order.

Two explanations are presented to clarify how we know that the goat for Azazel was sent away before the Kohen Gadol burned the sacrificial parts.

### 2) The meeting between the Kohen Gadol and the one who led the goat to Azazel

The Gemara records how the messenger would report to the Kohen Gadol that he performed his duty.

The Gemara digresses and analyzes other greetings and verses related to life.

### 3) Exiting the Beis HaMikdash after the service

A Baraisa retells an incident of a Kohen Gadol leaving the Beis HaMikdash after completing the service.

**4) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the difference between the garments of the Kohen Gadol and the garments of the regular kohen. Details regarding the use of the Urim v'tumim are presented.

### 5) The kohen's garments

A Baraisa teaches about the different threads used for different cloths in the Beis HaMikdash.

### 6) שש

The source that items described with the term שש means six-fold threads is identified.

R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina explains how we know that the term שש refers to linen.

Ravina presents an alternative source for the definition of שש as linen.

R' Ashi unsuccessfully challenges this source.

### 7) משזר

The source that items described with the term משזר means eight-fold threads is identified.

The derivation is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### The garments of the Kohen Gadol for honor and glory

כהן גדול משמש בשמונה כלים וההדייט בארבעה

The Torah tells us (Shemos 28:2) that the special clothing of the Kohen was to be "for his honor and glory." The uniform of the Kohen served to have him stand out with distinction among his fellow men. Yet the subsequent verse (3) highlights the significance of the garments in different terms. There, we find "They shall make the garments of sanctity for Aharon...to sanctify him to minister to Me." Here, the unique raiments of the Kohen are described in terms of the service of the Kohen in the Mikdash.

We can say that, in fact, the garments encompassed both of these functions. There were some garments which contained gold, while there were others which were of pure white linen. Whenever the Kohen entered into the Kodosh Kodoshim on Yom Kippur, he would not wear the garments which contained gold, for this would recall the memory of the sin of the Golden Calf. At the auspicious moment on Yom Kippur when the Kohen was praying for the welfare of the Jewish nation, it was hardly the time for such an accusatory thought to be present. This is the reason that he wore only the white, linen garments as he entered the Kodosh Kodoshim. We may ask, however, how Aharon himself could enter the inner sanctum at all. After all, gold or not, Aharon himself was instrumental in fashioning the Golden Calf. Although he tried to delay the matter, he was the leader of the nation during this great sin.

We must conclude, therefore, that Aharon did not sin at all during that episode. The commentators concur that Aharon bore no guilt at all in terms of the debacle of the Golden Calf. Accordingly, although Aharon possessed garments which contained gold, yet it was specifically the garments which were disal-

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. How does Rava demonstrate that pasuk כ"ג is not in chronological order?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Why were there two different ways the messenger would report to the Kohen Gadol that he fulfilled his responsibility?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What are the eight garments worn by the Kohen Gadol?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. How do we explain new halachos found in Sefer Yechezkel?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
by the Geller family

In loving memory of their mother and grandmother  
מרת חנה בת ר' יעקב מאיר, ע"ה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The size of the Tefillin shel Rosh

כהן גדול משמש בשמונה כלים וההדיוט בארבעה...ומצנפת

The Kohen Gadol served wearing eight garments and the regular kohen served wearing four... and מצנפת

Riva<sup>1</sup> notes that the Mishnah mentions only one hat, the מצנפת, for both the regular kohen as well as the Kohen Gadol even though the Torah refers to the hat worn by the Kohen Gadol as a מגבעת. The reason is that there was a slight difference between the מצנפת and the מגבעת. The Kohen Gadol wore the tzitz just above the hairline, thereby pushing his tefillin back, and leaving less room for his hat. Regular kohanim, however, only needed to leave room for their tefillin, so their hat could be slightly larger. Tosafos<sup>2</sup> infers from Riva that the correct size for tefillin is two fingerbreadths. The Gemara in Eruvin<sup>3</sup> states that there is room for two tefillin on the head. Since the Riva stated that the tzitz was in the place where the tefillin sit, there is only room left for one tefillin. Therefore, since the Gemara in Sukkah<sup>4</sup> states that the tzitz was two fingerbreadths it must be that the tefillin were also two fingerbreadths. Rosh<sup>5</sup> quotes another source that draws this same conclusion, but he writes that we are not particular about this size, and our tefillin are larger. Mishnah Berurah<sup>6</sup> however writes that one should be particular about this matter.

Rav Yosef Shaul Nathanson<sup>7</sup> raises a difficulty with a practice advocated by Kabbalists from the conclusion of Riva. Kabbalists write that those who are known to be pious should wear

(Insight...Continued from page 1)

lowed from entering the Kodosh Kodoshim, while Aharon himself was allowed to enter. This clearly demonstrated that it was the gold that was objectionable, while Aharon's presence was not problematic. This situation served not only as a service to Hashem, but also as an honor and for the glory of Aharon as the verses state. It was in this manner that his integrity was sustained and promoted as being totally holy and saintly, and his character was clear and free from sin in the episode of the Golden Calf. ■

two tefillin at the same time, Rashi's and Rabbeinu Tam's. Rav Nathanson asks that the Kohen Gadol was certainly a person who would be pious and yet he could not have worn two tefillin since the tzitz only left room for one. However, there is the well-known opinion of Rav Chaim of Tzanz<sup>8</sup> who maintains that there is room for two tefillin one next to the other. According to Rav Chaim, it is possible even for the Kohen Gadol to wear two tefillin at the same time. ■

1. מובא דבריו בתוספות הרא"ש ע"א: וז"ל, "וריב"א פירש דמצנפת ומגבעת לאו חדא נינהו אלא של כ"ג קרוים מצנפת והיא קטנה לפי שהיה צריך להניח על ראשו ציץ ותפילין... אבל של כהן הדיוט היתה גדולה כי היתה מכסה כל כל הראש ולא היה משייר אלא מקום לתפילין וכו'." וכן הובא בריטב"א ד"ה בכתנות
2. מובא דבריו בריטב"א שם ובתוס' ישנים בשם רבי ע"ש
3. עירובין צה
4. סוכה ה
5. הל' תפילין סי' ל"ג
6. מ"ב סי' ל"ב ס"ק קפ"ט, "ומ"מ נכון לחוש לדברי הגאונים שסוברין שלכתחילה לא יעשה אותן קטנים מאצבעיים על אצבעיים והיינו עם התיאורא וכו'."
7. שו"ת שואל ומשיב מהדורה א' ח"ב סי' ע"ה
8. שו"ת דברי חיים ח"ב אר"ח סי' ו' ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The wine libation

הרוצה לנסך יין על גבי המזבח ימלא גרונו של תלמידי חכמים יין

The great R' Meir Arik, זת"ל, the former Av Beis Din of Botach once visited the Imrei Emes in Vienna. As they discussed various Torah topics, R' Meir Arik asked a question regarding the subject of our Gemara. "If a person desires to offer נסכים in our days, why does the Gemara mention that it can only be fulfilled by filling the mouths of Torah scholars? Why doesn't the Gemara suggest a more standard solution to satisfy his quest? If he studies the laws of pouring wine on the altar, he would receive credit for having brought this offering, as we find (Menachos 110a),

'Anyone who studies the laws of a chatas or asham is credited for having brought a chatas or asham.' Why doesn't the Gemara suggest this possibility?"

As the question was completed, the Imrei Emes immediately responded, "The Gemara in Menachos does not say it!"

When he heard this, Rav Meir was so stirred that his face flamed a bright red. As he left the presence of the Imrei Emes, he remarked to his student who had accompanied him, "What a wonder! I have asked numerous Gedolim this very question, and none of their explanations seemed adequate to me. The Gerrer Rebbe has given me a straightforward answer! The truth is certainly as he said!"

Rav Meir Arik explained, "The Gemara in Menachos is based on the verse (Vayikra 7:37): "This is the law of the olah, of the minchah, of the chattas,...and the

shelamim." We cannot just decide that learning about a thing can substitute for doing it—we must have a verse that teaches us the principle. And since the verse does not mention נסכים explicitly, it means that in this case learning does not suffice to substitute for doing it!"

The Chasam Sofer, זת"ל, held that study of the halachos is like bringing the wine offering, but for those unable to do so, there is another way. He can give a scholar "wine"— which includes all forms of material assistance. The scholar brings the sacrifice through learning, and the donor completes the service with a libation of support.

As the Imrei Emes said on another occasion, our Gemara singles out the ניסוך היין because this is a rectification that even the unlearned can do! ■

