

The width of the courtyard – רוחב העזרה: The width of the courtyard was 135 cubits. The distance from the northern wall to the place where the animals were flayed and sliced on pillars was eight cubits. The width of the pillars section was twelve and a half cubits. The width of the tables was eight cubits, and next to that was the area of the rings, which was twenty-four cubits. Between the rings and the altar was a distance of eight cubits. The altar and the ramp extended for sixty-two cubits, after which there was a distance of twelve and a half cubits to the southern wall. The Rambam, in contrast to Rashi, rules in accordance with the measurements in tractate *Middot*, evenly dividing the unstated measurements (*Kesef Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 5:13–15).

מִן הַדְּרוֹם לַצֶּפוֹן מֵאָה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וְחֲמִשׁ; הַכֶּבֶשׂ וְהַמִּזְבֵּחַ שְׁשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם, מִן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְלִטְבַּעוֹת שְׂמוֹנֶה אַמּוֹת, מְקוֹם הַטְּבָעוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבַּע, מִן הַטְּבָעוֹת לְשִׁלְחָנוֹת אַרְבַּע, מִן הַשִּׁלְחָנוֹת לַנִּנְסִין אַרְבַּע, מִן הַנִּנְסִין לְכוֹתֵל עֲזָרָה שְׂמוֹנֶה אַמּוֹת, וְהַמּוֹתָר בֵּין הַכֶּבֶשׂ וְלְכוֹתֵל וּמְקוֹם הַנִּנְסִין.

The Gemara provides the dimensions of the Temple's width^H from south to north, a total of 135 cubits. The ramp and the altar^N together were sixty-two cubits. The ramp and altar were each thirty-two cubits long, but two cubits of the upper part of the altar were subsumed in the base and ledge surrounding the altar. There were eight cubits from the altar to the rings to the north of the altar, through which the heads of the sacrificial animals were placed for slaughter. The area of the rings itself was twenty-four cubits, and from the rings to the tables on which the animals were rinsed there were an additional four cubits. From the tables^N to the pillars on which the animals were suspended for flaying there were an additional four cubits. From the pillars to the courtyard wall there were eight cubits. The total to this point is 110 cubits. And the balance of twenty-five cubits was between the ramp and the southern wall, along with the area filled by the pillars themselves, which was not included in the above tally. This yields a total of 135 cubits.

וְאִי סֵלְקָא דְעֵתִיד מִדּוֹת רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הִיא – מִזְבֵּחַ בְּאֶמְצַע עֲזָרָה מִמְּשַׁכְּחַת לִיהָ? הֲאֵר וּבֹא דְמִזְבֵּחַ בְּדָרוֹם קֵאִי!

And if it enters your mind to say that the *mishnayot* in tractate *Middot* are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, do you find the altar in the middle of the courtyard? Most of the altar stands in the southern part of the courtyard.

NOTES

The ramp and the altar, etc. – הַכֶּבֶשׂ וְהַמִּזְבֵּחַ וכו' – Despite the apparent precision in the measurements given, it is clear that some details were omitted, e.g., the length of the table area. Similarly, the spaces between the ramp and the wall on one end, and the area of the pillars on the other end, are not precisely delineated. Furthermore, there are certain differences of opinion with regard to the Temple measurements. According to the *Me'iri* and the Rambam there were twelve and a half cubits between the ramp and the southern wall, and the width of the section of the pillars was also twelve and a half cubits. Between the pillars and the northern wall were eight cubits, which was also the length of the table area,

while the distance between the tables and the pillars was eight cubits.

The tables – הַשִּׁלְחָנוֹת: The space filled by the tables is not mentioned in the text, and Rashi explains that he relies on the description in the book of Ezekiel that states that each table was a cubit and a half long. Based on that, the table area was six cubits long. Of course, conceivably, the top of the tables might have been wider than the space filled by their legs. In addition, the measure would be affected by the manner in which they were positioned (see *Me'iri, Leviyat Hen*, and Rav Shmuel Strashun).

Perek I
Daf 17 Amud a

NOTES

This chamber was removed – הָאֵי לְשִׁבְחָה אֶקְצוּי מִקְצֵיא: According to Rashi, this chamber was long and could be seen from both corners. Rabbi Moshe HaDarshan writes that it was equidistant from the two corners and stood in the middle of the western side of the Hall of the Hearth (*Arukh; Me'iri*).

It appears to him to be in the south...in the north – מִתְחַוֵּיא – הָאֵי לְשִׁבְחָה אֶקְצוּי מִקְצֵיא, וְדֹאֲתֵי מִצְפוֹן – מִתְחַוֵּיא לִיהָ בְּדָרוֹם, וְדֹאֲתֵי מִדְּרוֹם – מִתְחַוֵּיא לִיהָ בְּצִפּוֹן.

From the fact that we raise a contradiction that the shewbread – מִדְּרָמִינַן לְחֵם הַפָּנִים: This is an example of the Gemara raising a question from a source that does not appear in the sources that are available nowadays. It is possible that this contradiction and its resolution were discussed at the time, but no appropriate spot for the discussion was found in the Talmud. There is no Gemara accompanying the mishna of tractate *Middot* (Rabbeinu Hananel).

אֵלָּא לֹא שָׁמַע מִינָהּ: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב הִיא, שָׁמַע מִינָהּ.

Rather, must one not conclude from it that that the *mishnayot* in tractate *Middot* are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov? The Gemara concludes: Indeed, conclude from it that this is so.

רַב אֲדָא בְּרִיהַ דְּרַב יְצֻחֲק אָמַר: הָאֵי לְשִׁבְחָה אֶקְצוּי מִקְצֵיא, וְדֹאֲתֵי מִצְפוֹן – מִתְחַוֵּיא לִיהָ בְּדָרוֹם, וְדֹאֲתֵי מִדְּרוֹם – מִתְחַוֵּיא לִיהָ בְּצִפּוֹן.

In an additional attempt to resolve the contradiction with regard to the Chamber of the Lambs, Rav Adda, son of Rav Yitzhak, said: This chamber was removed^N from the corner, as it was not actually in the corner of the Hall of the Hearth but was located along the middle of the western side of the hall. And therefore, for one who comes from the north, the chamber appears to him to be in the south of the hall; and for one who comes from the south, the chamber appears to him to be in the north of the hall.^N

וּמִסֵּתְבְּרָא דְבַמְעַרְבִית דְּרֹמִית הוּאִי. מִמּוֹאֵי – מִדְּרָמִינַן לְחֵם הַפָּנִים אֵלֶּחֶם הַפָּנִים

The Gemara comments: In any event, it is reasonable to say that this chamber was closer to the southwest corner than it was to the northwest corner. From where does one arrive at that conclusion? From the fact that we raise a contradiction between the mishna in tractate *Tamid*, where we learned that the chamber in which the shewbread^N was prepared stood in the northeast corner, and the mishna in tractate *Middot*, where we learned that the chamber in which the shewbread was prepared stood in the southeast corner.

ומשנינו, אמר רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: מר קא חשיב דרך ימין, ומר קא חשיב דרך שמאל.

And we resolve the contradiction based on what Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: **The Master** in tractate *Middot* envisions the chambers as one coming **via the right**, from the south to the east, then to the north and then to the west. And **the Master** in tractate *Tamid* envisions the chambers as one coming **via the left**,^{NB} from the south to the west, then to the north and then to the east. Both agree with regard to the location of the chamber in which the shewbread was prepared; they merely describe that location from different perspectives.

NOTES

Coming via the right... via the left – דרך ימין... דרך שמאל: In the *Tosefot Ri HaLavan* this entire discussion is explained. There were six chambers in the Hall of the Hearth; four of the six are listed in tractate *Middot* and four of the six are listed in tractate *Tamid*. Those listed in tractate *Tamid* are the four that were on the sacred side of the Hall of the Hearth; those listed in tractate *Middot* are those chambers that opened into the Hall of the Hearth. In that way, several of the difficulties are resolved.

BACKGROUND

The Master in tractate *Middot* envisions via the right, the Master in tractate *Tamid* envisions via the left – מר קא חשיב דרך ימין, ומר קא חשיב דרך שמאל: The approach in tractate *Middot* was as follows: One beginning in the southwest and proceeding right, or counterclockwise, encounters the chambers in the following order: Lambs, Shewbread, Altar Stones (Hearth), Hall of Immersion (Seals).

The approach in tractate *Tamid* was as follows: One beginning in the southwest and proceeding left, or clockwise, encounters the chambers in the following order: Lambs, Seals, Hearth, Shewbread.



Chambers in the Hall of the Hearth

Perek I

Daf 17 Amud b

אי אמרת בשלמא במערבית דרומית הואי – היינו דמתרץ לתם הפנים אל תם הפנים. אלא אי אמרת צפונת מערבית הואי, סוף סוף מאי תירוץא דלתם הפנים? אלא לאו שמע מינה: במערבית דרומית הואי, שמע מינה.

Granted, if you say that the Chamber of the Lambs was actually closer to the southwest corner, that is how Rav Huna resolves the contradiction between one mishna discussing the shewbread and the other mishna discussing the shewbread. However, if you say that the Chamber of the Lambs was in the northwest corner, ultimately, what is the resolution with regard to the shewbread? Even if you envision the path from the other direction, the Chamber of the Seals interposes between the Chamber of the Lambs and the chamber where the shewbread is prepared. Rather, must one not conclude from it that the Chamber of the Lambs was indeed in the southwest? The Gemara concludes: Indeed, conclude from it that this is so.

והאמר מר: כל פירות שאתה פונה לא יהיו אלא דרך ימין למזרח! הני מילי – בעבודה, אבל הקא – חושבנא בעלמא הוא.

The Gemara questions the assertion that one *tanna* envisions the chambers as one coming via the left. But didn't the Master say: All turns that you turn should be only to the right, which in certain cases is to the east? Here the turns are to the left. The Gemara answers: This restriction applies only in the course of performing the Temple service; however, here, it is a mere reckoning, and no priest actually proceeded that way from one chamber to the other.

”שכהן גדול מקריב חלק בראש ונטל חלק בראש”. תנו רבנן: כיצד מקריב חלק בראש? אומר: “עולה זו אני מקריב” מנחה זו אני מקריב.

It was taught in the mishna: As the High Priest sacrifices any portion that he chooses first and takes any portion^N that he chooses first.^H The Sages taught in a *baraita*: How does the High Priest sacrifice any portion that he chooses first? If the High Priest so desires, he says: This burnt-offering, I am sacrificing, or: This meal-offering, I am sacrificing. That is sufficient, and the High Priest does not participate in a lottery.

NOTES

The portion of the High Priest – חלק הפהון הגדול: In the Jerusalem Talmud the question is raised: With regard to sin-offerings and guilt-offerings, the High Priest takes the entire offering; why is he not entitled, if he so chooses, to take the two loaves and the shewbread in their entirety? The answer is that there is a distinction between an individual offering and a communal offering.

HALAKHA

The High Priest... takes any portion that he chooses first – כהן גדול... נוטל חלק בראש: The High Priest has the right to take the first portion from all sacrificial meat. If he wishes, he may declare: I will take this sin-offering or this guilt-offering (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 5:12).

NOTES

Four or five – ארבע או חמש: Support for this opinion is cited from the book of Samuel. When David takes refuge from Saul with the High Priest Ahimelech in Nov, he says to the High Priest: "And now what do you have here on hand, five loaves of bread? Let me have them" (I Samuel 21:4). Ahimelech then feeds David the shewbread (Rav Shmuel Strashun).

The High Priest does not take half – לא שקיל פלגא: One could ask: If the Rabbis reject the interpretation of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi that the phrase: For Aaron and his sons, means half for Aaron and half for his sons, from where do they derive that the High Priest is entitled to a greater portion? Apparently, everyone agrees that Aaron receives half; however, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi understands that it means precisely half, while the Rabbis maintain that he receives a bit less than half. The Rabbis believe it inappropriate for the High Priest, who is an individual, to receive the same number of loaves that is received by all the other priests together. Therefore, he receives one loaf fewer than they do (Gevurat Ari; Tosafot; Tosafot Yeshanim).

HALAKHA

The High Priest may take from the shewbread – כהן גדול: The High Priest takes half of the shewbread from every priestly watch, but it is not in keeping with the deference due the High Priest to give him a piece of a loaf. In the *Lehem Mishne* it is explained that the Rambam rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi based on the fact that the conclusion of the Gemara in tractate *Bava Batra* is in accordance with his opinion. Furthermore, the Rambam adopts Abaye's interpretation of the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi despite the principle that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rava in his disputes with Abaye, because Rava's opinion leaves some questions unanswered (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 4:14).

ביצד נוטל חלק בראש? אומר: "חטאת זו אני אוכל" "אשם זה אני אוכל". ונוטל חלה משתי חלות, ארבע או חמש ממעשה לחם הפנים. רבי אומר: לעולם חמש, שנאמר: "והיתתה לאהרן ולבניו" – מחצה לאהרן ומחצה לבניו.

הא גופה קשיא; אמרת: נוטל חלה אחת משתי חלות. מני – רבי היא, דאמר: פלגא שקיל. אימא מציעתא: ארבע או חמש ממעשה לחם הפנים – אתאן לרבנן, דאמרי: לא שקיל פלגא. אימא סיפא, רבי אומר: לעולם חמש. רישא וסיפא – רבי ומציעתא רבנן!

אמר אביי: רישא ומציעתא רבנן. ומודו רבנן בפרוסה, דלאו אורח ארעא למיתבה לכהן גדול.

How does the High Priest take any portion that he chooses first? The High Priest says: **This sin-offering, I am eating, or: This guilt-offering, I am eating. And he may even take one loaf of the two loaves offered on the festival of Shavuot.** He may take **four or five**^N of the twelve shewbread^N loaves that are distributed to the priests every Shabbat. **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says:** The High Priest always takes **five** of the twelve shewbread loaves, as it is stated: **"It shall be for Aaron and his sons and they shall eat it in a sacred place"** (Leviticus 24:9). From the fact that Aaron and his sons are listed separately, it is derived that **half** of the loaves were given to Aaron, or the High Priests who succeeded him, and **half** were given to his sons. Since, as explained below, only ten of the loaves were actually distributed, the High Priest received five.

This baraita is itself difficult, as it is self-contradictory. First you said: **He takes one loaf of the two loaves** offered on the festival of *Shavuot*. **Whose opinion is this? It is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who said that the High Priest takes half.** Say the middle clause of the *baraita* as follows: The High Priest takes **four or five** of the twelve shewbread loaves; we have come to the opinion of the Rabbis, who say that the High Priest **does not take half**^N but takes less than half. Say the last clause of the *baraita* as follows: **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says that the High Priest always takes five.** The Gemara asks: Is that to say that **the first clause and the last clause** of the *baraita* are in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and the middle clause** is in accordance with the opinion of **the Rabbis**? That conclusion is difficult.

Abaye said: The first clause and the middle clause of the *baraita* are in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and in the case of the two loaves, **the Rabbis concede with regard to a piece of a loaf that it is inappropriate to give it to the High Priest.** According to the Rabbis, the High Priest should actually receive less than one loaf, as in their opinion he is entitled to less than half; however, since it is inappropriate to give him a piece of the loaf, he takes an entire loaf as his portion.

Perek I

Daf 18 Amud a

ומאי ארבע או חמש – לרבנן, דאמרי: נכנס נוטל שש, ויוצא נוטל שש. ושכר הגפת דלתות לא, משתים עשרה בעי מיפלג, בציר חדא מפלגא – חמש שקיל.

And what is the meaning of **four or five**; i.e., when does the High Priest take four loaves and when does he take five? According to the Rabbis, who say: The priestly watch that is **incoming** on Shabbat takes six of the loaves, and the **outgoing** watch takes six, and the incoming watch receives **no** greater portion as **payment for closing the doors**, it is from twelve loaves that the High Priest **must divide** and take his share, but he receives **half** of the loaves **less one**, meaning that he takes **five**. According to the Rabbis, the High Priest receives less than half; however, since it is inappropriate to give him a piece of a loaf, less than half is five whole loaves.

לרבי יהודה דאמר: נכנס נוטל שבע, שתים בשכר הגפת דלתות, ויוצא נוטל חמש. מעשר בעי מיפלג, בציר חדא מפלגא – ושקיל ארבע.

According to **Rabbi Yehuda, who said:** The priestly watch that is **incoming** on Shabbat takes **seven** of the loaves, **two** of which are **payment for closing the doors**; and the **outgoing** watch takes **five** loaves, it is from **ten** that he **must divide** the loaves. Those two of the twelve loaves are a separate payment and are not factored into the tally of those designated for distribution. **Subtract one from half** of that total, as subtracting less than one loaf would lead to a situation where the High Priest receives a piece of a loaf, which is inappropriate. **And therefore, the High Priest takes four.**

רבא אומר: כולה רבי היא, ושכר לה רבי יהודה. ואלא מאי ארבע? הא חמש בעי למשקל!

Rava said that the *baraita* should be explained differently. The **entire baraita** is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and he holds** in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda** that only ten loaves are divided. **Rather, what** then is the meaning of the statement that the High Priest takes **four** loaves? According to **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, doesn't he need to take five?**