A substitute for a sin-offering is left to die (Rambam, Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Pesu’el HaMukdashim 41, Hilkhot Temura 3:1). The Gemara comments: So, too, it is reasonable that this is the offering referred to in the baraita, for if it should enter your mind to say that we are dealing with the bull of the High Priest, consider the following: Is it only Shabbat and ritual impurity that the substitution of the bull does not override, which indicates that one may sacrifice this substitute on a weekday? It is a substitute for a sin-offering, and the halakha is that the substitute for a sin-offering is left to die.* Rather, we certainly must be dealing with the ram for a burnt-offering, as the substitute for a burnt-offering cannot be sacrificed.

The Gemara rejects this supporting argument: No, it is actually possible that the offering referred to in the baraita is the Yom Kippur bull of the High Priest, and what is the substitution that was mentioned? It does not refer to a substitution of the bull, but rather the baraita deals with the general category of substitution, i.e., it means that the phenomenon of substitution in general includes halakhot that do not apply to offerings.

The Gemara asks: If so, one can also say that the sacrifice mentioned in the baraita means the general category of sacrifices, rather than a specific offering. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: The baraita is not teaching about a general category of sacrifices, i.e., it is definitely not dealing with the phenomenon of offerings in general.

The Gemara continues: From where do I know that this is so? From the fact that it is taught: There is a stricture that applies to the substitution beyond the strictures that apply to the initial offering, in that the sanctity of the substitution takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and the substitute cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacrificed status for its wool to be sheared and to be worked. And should it enter your mind to say: What is the sacrifice mentioned here, it means the general category of sacrifices; this cannot be the case, as there is an example of an offering to which these halakhot also apply.

e.g., a firstborn or an animal tithe, the sanctity of which takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and this offering cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacrificed status for its wool to be sheared and to be worked. Rather, you must say that the baraita is not teaching a general category of sacrifices, but when it states: Offering, it is referring to a particular one.

The Gemara asks: And what is different about the two statements, i.e., why does the tanna deal with a specific case in one area, but a general category in the other? The Gemara explains: Substitution is one category, as there is no difference between one case of substitution and another. By contrast, with regard to sacrifices, there is a firstborn and there is the animal tithe, whose halakhot differ from other offerings, and therefore one cannot establish a single general principle. Consequently, the tanna certainly is referring to a specific offering.

NOTES

A substitute for a sin-offering – הָלַכַּת תּוֹרָה. The offerings of the firstborn and of the animal tithe differ from all other offerings in the manner of their consecration. The firstborn is consecrated in utero, i.e., the firstborn calf is automatically sacred; similarly, the tenth animal counted out of the pen is consecrated as the tithe, even if it is blemished. Since these animals are automatically consecrated, they cannot be redeemed and can never be sheared or put to work.

The Gemara: And what is different about the two statements, i.e., why does the tanna deal with a specific case in one area, but a general category in the other? The Gemara explains: Substitution is one category, as there is no difference between one case of substitution and another. By contrast, with regard to sacrifices, there is a firstborn and there is the animal tithe, whose halakhot differ from other offerings, and therefore one cannot establish a single general principle. Consequently, the tanna certainly is referring to a specific offering.

HALAKHA

A substitute for a sin-offering – הָלַכַּת תּוֹרָה. The offerings of the firstborn and of the animal tithe differ from all other offerings in the manner of their consecration. The firstborn is consecrated in utero, i.e., the firstborn calf is automatically sacred; similarly, the tenth animal counted out of the pen is consecrated as the tithe, even if it is blemished. Since these animals are automatically consecrated, they cannot be redeemed and can never be sheared or put to work.

A substitute for a sin-offering – הָלַכַּת תּוֹרָה. The offerings of the firstborn and of the animal tithe differ from all other offerings in the manner of their consecration. The firstborn is consecrated in utero, i.e., the firstborn calf is automatically sacred; similarly, the tenth animal counted out of the pen is consecrated as the tithe, even if it is blemished. Since these animals are automatically consecrated, they cannot be redeemed and can never be sheared or put to work.
The Gemara continues the previous discussion: And according to the opinion of Rav Sheshet, who explains that the offering in question is not the bull of the High Priest but his ram, rather than establishing and interpreting this baraita as referring to the ram of Aaron, let him establish that it deals with the Paschal offering, which overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity and one can perform substitution for it, as according to all opinions, it is the offering of an individual. The Gemara answers: Rav Sheshet maintains that one may not slaughter the Paschal lamb on behalf of an individual, but only for a group. This means that it is not an offering of an individual but, at the very least, that of partners. For this reason, one cannot perform substitution for a Paschal lamb.

The Gemara asks: And let Rav Sheshet establish the baraita as referring to the second Pesah, which is slaughtered by an individual. The Gemara answers: Does the second Pesah override ritual impurity? Since this offering does not override ritual impurity, it cannot be the offering referred to in the baraita.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rava: And according to the tanna of the aforementioned baraita, concerning the dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yaakov, what is different with regard to the Paschal offering, that he calls it the offering of an individual? And what is different with regard to the Festival peace-offering, which is eaten with the Paschal offering, that he calls it a communal offering? If this distinction is because the Festival peace-offering is brought by a multitude, i.e., the entire nation brings it, the Paschal offering is also brought by a multitude, not as an individual offering. Rava replied: There is the second Pesah, which is not brought by a multitude, and therefore the tanna does not call the Paschal offering a communal offering.

He said to him: If so, that the second Pesah is a communal offering, it should override Shabbat and ritual impurity. He said to him: Yes, as the opinion of this tanna is in accordance with the one who said that the second Pesah overrides ritual impurity. As it was taught in a baraita: The second Pesah overrides Shabbat, but it does not override ritual impurity. Rabbi Yehuda says: It even overrides ritual impurity. The Gemara asks: What is the reason of the first tanna? The first tanna could have said to you that one brings a second Pesah solely because ritual impurity overrode his obligation to sacrifice the first Pesah, i.e., he did not sacrifice the first Pesah because he was impure at that time. And should he now perform the second Pesah in a state of ritual impurity?

And Rabbi Yehuda could have said to you that, with regard to the second Pesah, the verse states: “According to all the statute of the Paschal offering they shall keep it” (Numbers 9:12), which indicates that it should even be brought in a state of ritual impurity, unlike the first Pesah. As for the claim of the first tanna, that the whole reason for the second Pesah is due to ritual impurity, Rabbi Yehuda could respond: The Torah sought an opportunity for one who was impure at the time of the first Pesah to perform it in a state of ritual purity; if he did not merit to perform it in purity, he should nevertheless perform it even in a state of ritual impurity.

NOTES

Let him establish that it deals with the Paschal offering – מאי דחויי פסח. As the Paschal lamb is not a communal offering, how could the statement of the baraita: It applies to an individual as to the community, be explained as referring to the Paschal lamb? One answer is that according to the opinion of Rabbi Natan, the entire Jewish people can participate in a single Paschal lamb, if there are not enough offerings to divide them into groups. Consequently, the Paschal lamb can be considered either a communal offering, when a single animal is slaughtered for everyone, or an individual offering, when many animals are sacrificed for separate groups.

One may not slaughter the Paschal lamb on behalf of an individual – מאי דחויי פסח. Among the decisions of a Paschal offering, despite the fact that at least one other person must be registered for the offering when it is slaughtered. Consequently, it is possible for a Paschal offering, before it is slaughtered, to belong to a single person who can perform substitution (Rashash). Perhaps it can be stated that since the animal is not sacrificed for one person, it cannot be called an offering of an individual, and therefore it does not fit the description of the mishna.

It is brought by a multitude – מאי דחויי פסח. There is a difference between an offering brought by a multitude, i.e., the entire Jewish people, but which is not classified as a communal offering, as it is not brought in the form of a partnership, and between the Festival peace-offering, which is brought by the community on behalf of everyone.

The second Pesah – מאי דחויי פסח. The institution of the second Pesah is explained in the Torah (Numbers 9:9–15). Any individual who was unable, due to no fault of his own, to bring a Paschal offering on the fourteenth of Nisan must sacrifice one on the fourteenth of the following month of Iyar. This person might have been impure or far away from the Temple during the festival of Passover. The details of this halakha are discussed in tractate Pesahim, where the tanna'im debate which features of the first Pesah apply to the second offering, and in what ways the second Pesah differs from the first.
Returning to Rabbi Elazar’s question as to whether a High Priest can perform substitution for his bull, the Gemara seeks to prove that the other priests were not full partners in this offering but only gained atonement incidentally. And let me derive this halakha from the fact that the Merciful One states: “And Aaron shall sacrifice the bull of the sin-offering, which is for himself” (Leviticus 16:11), indicating that the High Priest brings the bull from his own property.

As it was taught in a baraita: “Which is for himself” means that he brings it from his own property and not from the property of the community. I might have thought that the High Priest may not bring this offering from the property of the community because the community as a whole does not gain atonement through it, but he may bring it from the property of his fellow priests, as his fellow priests do gain atonement through it. Therefore the verse states: “Which is for himself,” i.e., it must belong to him and no one else.

I might have thought that the High Priest should not bring the bull from the property of the other priests ab initio, but if he did bring it from their property, the offering is valid. Therefore, the verse continues and states again: “And he shall slaughter the bull for the sin-offering, which is for himself” (Leviticus 16:11); the text repeats this phrase: “Which is for himself,” to emphasize that this requirement is indispensable and that if the High Priest brings a bull that belongs to someone else, the offering is invalid.

The Gemara rejects this proof: And according to your reasoning, if his fellow priests do not acquire a share in the bull, how does it alone for them? Since they achieve atonement through the offering, they must own a share in it. Rather, you must say that the property [bei gaza] of Aaron the High Priest is different in that the Merciful One rendered it ownerless with regard to his fellow priests. Although the High Priest brings a bull from his own funds, it is as though he sanctifies it on behalf of all the priests. But if so, here too, with regard to substitution, we could likewise say that the property of Aaron is different in that the Merciful One rendered it ownerless with regard to his fellow priests. Consequently, there is no proof from here that a High Priest can perform substitution for his bull.

MISHNA The High Priest would then walk west through the Sanctuary until he reaches the area between the two curtains that separated the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies, and the space between them was one cubit. Rabbi Yosei says: There was only one curtain there, as it is stated: “And the curtain shall divide for you between the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies” (Exodus 26:33).

HALAKHA From his own and not from the community – כֶּפֶךָא לְהוּ אֵלֶּה רַחוֹמָא. Although the High Priest buys his bull with his own money, the Torah rendered his property ownerless and considered all of the priests joint owners of this offering (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 5.13).

He would walk through the Sanctuary – כָּאָה לְמִי מִי. The High Priest walked through the Sanctuary until he reached the curtain, which he pinned to one side. He entered the Holy of Holies until he reached the Ark, and placed the coal pan between the staves of the Ark poles. In the Second Temple, which lacked the Ark, he would place the coal pan on the foundation rock (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 4.1).
The Gemara asks: Rabbi Yosei is saying well to the Rabbis, i.e., Rabbi Yosei provides solid support for his opinion. And the Rabbis could say to you: This applies only in the Tabernacle, which had but one curtain. However, in the Second Temple, since there was no one-cubit partition separating the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary of the Temple, as it was only in the First Temple that there was a one-cubit partition, and the Rabbis were uncertain with regard to the sanctity of the space occupied by the one-cubit partition, whether it had the sanctity of the inside of the Holy of Holies, or the sanctity of the outside area of the Sanctuary, therefore the Sages of the time prepared two curtains to enclose this space of uncertain status.

The Sages taught: When the High Priest walked to the Holy of Holies, he walked on the south side between the inner altar and the candelabrum. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Meir says that he walked on the north side between the table and the altar. And some say he passed between the table and the wall. The Gemara asks: Whose opinion is introduced by the title: Some say? Rav Hisda said: It is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei in our mishna, according to whom there is only one curtain and who said that the entrance was positioned in the north. According to all opinions, the entrance to the Holy of Holies was located in the north, and since Rabbi Yosei believed that there was just one curtain, the High Priest would walk in a straight line toward this entrance along the north side of the Sanctuary.

And Rabbi Yehuda maintains that there were two curtains, and therefore he could have said to you that although the entrance to the Holy of Holies was on the north side, because there were two curtains, one behind the other, the entrance was positioned in the south. The High Priest entered on the south side and walked between the curtains to the north of the inner curtain where he entered the Holy of Holies. The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Meir, in accordance with whose opinion does he hold? If he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda with regard to the place of the entrance, the High Priest should enter as explained by Rabbi Yehuda; conversely, if he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, he should enter as explained by Rabbi Yosei.

The Gemara answers: Actually, Rabbi Meir holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and he could have said to you: The tables, the one holding the shewbread and other tables next to it, were arranged north to south, and the table blocked him on the north side, and therefore the High Priest could not enter in a direct line, as the space was too narrow.

And if you wish, say instead: Actually the tables were arranged east to west, and due to the honor of the Divine Presence, it was not proper conduct.

This applies only in the Tabernacle – היכן העיר, ילול יוכבד, את בקימה היה או אימן. It is obvious to the Gemara that a single curtain was used in the Tabernacle, whereas in the First Temple, a wall divided the Sanctuary from the Holy of Holies. Nevertheless, it is likely that a curtain was hung in front of the doorway in the wall of the First Temple as well, to conceal the activity taking place in the inner area. In the Second Temple, they had no choice but to hang a curtain, as it was impossible to build a wall there for several reasons, as explained by Rashi.

Whether it had the sanctity of the inside or of the outside – יא יא קמך אי כלאינ. Tosafot ask why they didn’t simply hang a curtain on the outside of the cubit where the wall stood, and thereby solve the problem. See Tosafot for their answers to this difficulty. One opinion is that had the curtain been hung out of position, the blood that was sprinkled toward it on several occasions would not be sprinkled in the proper manner, as this curtain would not be right next to the Holy of Holies (Gevurat Aril).

How were the tables arranged – כיוון המתווך军. King Solomon fashioned ten tables to beautify the Sanctuary, which he placed next to the table of the shewbread. The central table was certainly positioned east to west along the length of the Sanctuary, like the other sacred vessels. The debate here concerns the position of the other tables. Some commentators point out that these extra tables were absent in the Second Temple, and the shewbread table stood alone in the Sanctuary, although there were additional two tables positioned on the outside upon which the bread was occasionally placed. Nevertheless, the route of the High Priest in the Second Temple is subject to the same dispute, as the practice of the First Temple would have been followed in the Second Temple as well, despite the fact that the High Priest could have approached the Holy of Holies in a different manner in the Second Temple.