

The substitute for a sin-offering is left to die – תְּמוּרַת חֲטָאת לְמִיתָה אֲזָלָא: A substitute for a sin-offering is left to die (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:1, *Hilkhot Temura* 3:1).

הַכִּי נִמְי מִסֶּתֶרֶבְרָא, דְּאִי סְלִיקָא דְעֵתְךָ דְּפָרוּ; תְּמוּרָה דְּפָר, שְׁבֵת וְטוּמְאָה הוּא דְלֹא דְחִיָּא, הָא בְּחֹל מְקָרִיב קָרְבָּה? הָא תְּמוּרַת חֲטָאת הִיא, וְתְמוּרַת חֲטָאת לְמִיתָה אֲזָלָא!

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.¹¹ Rather, we certainly must be dealing with the ram for a burnt-offering, as the substitute for a burnt-offering cannot be sacrificed.

לֹא, לְעוֹלָם פָּרוּ. וּמֵאֵי תְמוּרָה – שֵׁם תְּמוּרָה.

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.

אִי הַכִּי זָבַח נִמְי – שֵׁם זָבַח. שֵׁם זָבַח לֹא קָתְנִי.

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.

מֵמֵאֵי? מִדְּקָתְנִי חוּמֵר בְּתְמוּרָה, שֶׁהַתְּמוּרָה חֲלָה עַל בְּעַל מוּם קָבוּעַ, וְאֵינָהּ יוֹצֵאתָ לְחֹלִין לִיגוּז וְלִיעָבֵד. וְאִי סְלִיקָא דְעֵתְךָ מֵאֵי זָבַח – שֵׁם זָבַח, וְהָא אֵיכָא

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-sacred 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,

Perek V
Daf 51 Amud a

בְּכוֹר וּמַעֲשֵׂר דְחֹלִין עַל בְּעַל מוּם קָבוּעַ, וְאֵין יוֹצֵאִין לְחֹלִין לִיגוּז וְלִיעָבֵד. אֲלֵא: שֵׁם זָבַח לֹא קָתְנִי.

e.g., a firstborn or an animal tithe,¹² the sanctity of which takes effect even on a permanently blemished animal, and this offering cannot vacate its sanctified status and assume non-sacred 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.

וּמֵאֵי שְׁנָא? תְּמוּרָה, שֵׁם תְּמוּרָה – אֲחַת הִיא, זָבַח – אֵיכָא בְּכוֹר וְאֵיכָא מַעֲשֵׂר.

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 firstborn or an animal tithe – בְּכוֹר וּמַעֲשֵׂר: 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.

HALAKHA

A firstborn or an animal tithe – בְּכוֹר וּמַעֲשֵׂר: The consecration of animals are permanently blemished. These animals may never be put to work or sheared (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Me'ila* 1:9).

The Paschal offering overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity – קָרְבַּן פֶּסַח דּוֹחָה שְׁבֵט וְטוּמְאָה: The sacrifice of the Paschal offering overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity in the event that most of the community is ritually impure (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 1:8, 7:1).

The second *Pesah* – פֶּסַח שְׁנִי: The second *Pesah* overrides Shabbat but does not override ritual impurity, in accordance with the anonymous opinion in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 10:15).

וְלִרְבֵּי שֵׁשֶׁת, אֲדַמּוּקִים לָהּ בְּאִילּוֹ
שֶׁל אֶהְרֹן לֹקְמָה בְּפֶסַח, דְּדוֹחָה
אֶת הַשְּׁבֵט וְאֶת הַטּוּמְאָה, וְעוֹשֶׂה
תְּמוּדָה דְּקָרְבַּן יְחִיד הוּא! קִסְפָּר: אֵין
שׁוֹחֲטִין הַפֶּסַח עַל הַיְחִיד.

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,^N which overrides Shabbat and ritual impurity^H 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,^N 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.

וְנוֹקְמִיהָ בְּפֶסַח שְׁנִי! – מִי דְחִי
טוּמְאָה?

The Gemara asks: **And let** Rav Sheshet establish the *baraita* as referring to the second *Pesah*,^H 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*.

אָמַר לִיהוּא רַב הוּנָא בְּרִיהַ דְּרַב
יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְרַבָּא: וְתַנָּא, מַאי שְׁנָא
פֶּסַח דְּקָרְיָ לִיהוּא קָרְבַּן יְחִיד, וּמַאי
שְׁנָא חֲגִיגָה דְּקָרְיָ לֵהּ קָרְבַּן צִיבּוּר?
אִי מְשׁוּם דְּאֶתִי בְּכַנּוּפִיָּא – פֶּסַח
נְמִי אֶתִי בְּכַנּוּפִיָּא! אִיכָא פֶּסַח שְׁנִי,
דְּלֹא אֶתִי בְּכַנּוּפִיָּא.

§ 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 Ya'akov, 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,^N 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*,**^N which is not brought by a multitude, and therefore the *tanna* does not call the Paschal offering a communal offering.

אָמַר לִיהוּ: אִם בֵּן, יְהִי דוֹחָה אֶת
הַשְּׁבֵט וְאֶת הַטּוּמְאָה! אָמַר לִיהוּ:
אֵין, כְּמָאן דְּאָמַר דְּחִי. דְּתַנָּא: פֶּסַח
שְׁנִי דוֹחָה אֶת הַשְּׁבֵט, וְאִינוּ דוֹחָה
אֶת הַטּוּמְאָה. רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: אֵף
דוֹחָה אֶת הַטּוּמְאָה. מַאי טַעְמָא
דְּתַנָּא קָמָא? אָמַר לֵךְ: מִפְּנֵי טוּמְאָה
דְּחִיתוּ, וְיַעֲשֶׂה בְּטוּמְאָה!

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?**

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר לֵךְ: אָמַר קָרָא
”כָּכֹל חֲקַת הַפֶּסַח יַעֲשׂוּ אוֹתוֹ” –
וְאֶפְּלוּ בְּטוּמְאָה. הַתּוֹרָה הַחִזְיָה
עָלָיו לַעֲשׂוֹתוֹ בְּטָהֳרָה, לֹא זָכָה –
יַעֲשֶׂנוּ בְּטוּמְאָה.

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 – לֹקְמָה: 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 – אֵין שׁוֹחֲטִין הַפֶּסַח עַל הַיְחִיד: There is a difficulty here. An individual can dedicate an animal for 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 – דְּאֶתִי בְּכַנּוּפִיָּא: 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* – פֶּסַח שְׁנִי: 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 Iyyar. 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.

LANGUAGE

Property [*bei gazza*] – בֵּי גַזָּא: Probably from the Old Persian ganza, meaning treasury.

NOTES

The Merciful One rendered it ownerless – דִּאֲפַקְרִיָּה רַחֲמָנָא – Since it is clear that the priests do gain atonement through the High Priest’s bull, it stands to reason that they must own some share in it. And as their partnership is not due to any sort of formal acquisition, we must say the Torah treats the offering as belonging to all of the priests. For the same reason, the priests should be considered partners in the offering with regard to substitution as well.

וְתִפּוֹק לִי דְאֲשֶׁר לוֹ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא.
מִשְׁלוֹ הוּא מְבִיא!

דִּתְנֵינָא: “אֲשֶׁר לוֹ” – מִשְׁלוֹ הוּא מְבִיא
וְלֹא מִשְׁלֵי צִיבוּר. יְכוּל לֵאמֹר לֹא יְבִיא מִשְׁלֵי
צִיבוּר, שְׂאִין הַצִּיבוּר מִתְּכַפְּרִין בוּ, אֲבָל
יְבִיא מִשְׁלֵי אֲחֵיו הַכֹּהֲנִים, שְׂהֵרִי אֲחֵיו
הַכֹּהֲנִים מִתְּכַפְּרִים בוּ – תְּלֻמוּד לֹאמַר:
“אֲשֶׁר לוֹ.”

יְכוּל לֹא יְבִיא. וְאִם הֵבִיא כֶּשֶׁר – תְּלֻמוּד
לֹאמַר: שׁוֹב “אֲשֶׁר לוֹ”, שְׁנָה הַכְּתוּב עָלָיו
לְעֵבֵב.

וְלִטְעֻמִּיךְ, אֲחֵיו הַכֹּהֲנִים אִי לֹא דְקִנּוּ
בְּגוּיָה הֵיכִי מִכֶּפֶר לְהוּ? אֵלָּא, שְׂאֵנִי בִי
גִזָּא דְאֶהְרֹן דִּאֲפַקְרִיָּה רַחֲמָנָא גְבִי אֲחֵיו
הַכֹּהֲנִים, הִכָּא [גְבִי תְּמוּרָה] נִמְי שְׂאֵנִי בִי
גִזָּא דְאֶהְרֹן דִּאֲפַקְרִיָּה רַחֲמָנָא גְבִי אֲחֵיו
הַכֹּהֲנִים:

מִתְנִי' הִיָּה מְהֵלֵךְ בְּהֵיכַל עַד שְׂמִינִיעַ
לְבֵין שְׁתֵּי הַפְּרוֹכֹת הַמְּבַדִּילוֹת בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ
וּבֵין קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדֶשִׁים, וּבִינְהֶן אַמְהָ. רַבִּי
יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: לֹא הִיָּתָה שָׁם אֵלָּא פְּרוֹכֶת
אַחַת בְּלֻבָד, שְׁנַאֲמַר: “וְהַבְּדִילָה הַפְּרוֹכֶת
לְכֶם בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדֶשִׁים.”

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.^h 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 atone for them?** Since they achieve atonement through the offering, they must own a share in it. **Rather**, you must say that the property [*bei gazza*]^l of Aaron the High Priest is different in that the Merciful One rendered it ownerlessⁿ 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 of 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^h 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

מִשְׁלוֹ וְלֹא מִשְׁלֵי – מִשְׁלוֹ וְלֹא מִשְׁלֵי
צִיבוּר: 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).

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).

הִיָּה מְהֵלֵךְ בְּהֵיכַל – הִיָּה מְהֵלֵךְ בְּהֵיכַל

אָמַר טְרַקְסִין – אָמַר טְרַקְסִין – The one-cubit partition and the curtains – **פְּרוּכּוֹת**: In the First Temple, there was a cubit-thick wall separating the Holy from the Holy of Holies. The Second Temple lacked this wall, and the Sages were unsure of the status of this cubit. They built the Holy of Holies a full twenty cubits and the Sanctuary forty cubits long, leaving an additional cubit between the chambers. Two curtains were hung in the space of that cubit, as explained by the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 4:2).

שְׁלֻחַנֵי מִזְבֵּחַ – שְׁלֻחַנֵי מִזְבֵּחַ: The tables in the Sanctuary were arranged east to west, along the length of the Sanctuary (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 3:12).

LANGUAGE

Partition [teraksin] – טְרַקְסִין: Apparently Greek in origin, the precise meaning of this word is unclear, as no known Greek term is an exact synonym. It might be related to **τηρήσων, tērēsōn**, a guard or overseer, or perhaps it is derived from a combination of two words: **θύρασι, thyrasi**, entrance, outside; and **ἔσωθεν, esōthen**, inner. The combination would mean outside/inside, as the term is explained in the Jerusalem Talmud. Another possible source is the Greek **θρίγκος, thrinkos**, which means closing or locking.

BACKGROUND

כְּלֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ בְּהֵיכַל – כְּלֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ: The sacred vessels in the Sanctuary – In the following illustration, the tables are positioned east to west, along the length of the Sanctuary. According to the other opinion, that they were arranged north to south, there was no space left for the High Priest to pass between the wall and the table.



Vessels in the Sanctuary

גַּמְ' שְׁפִיר קָאָמַר לְהוּ רַבִּי יוֹסֵי לְרַבְנָא! וְרַבְנָא אָמְרֵי לֵךְ: הֲנִי מִיָּלִי – בְּמִשְׁכַּן, אָבֵל בְּמִקְדָּשׁ שֵׁנִי בֵּין דְּלֵא הוּאֵי אָמַר טְרַקְסִין, וּבְמִקְדָּשׁ רֵאשׁוֹן הוּא דְהוּאֵי וְאִיסְתַּפְקָא לְהוּ לְרַבְנָא בְּקִדּוּשְׁתֵּיהּ אִי כְּלַפְנֵי אִי בְּלַחוּץ, וְעָבִיד שְׁתֵּי פְרוּכּוֹת.

GEMARA 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,**^N which had but one curtain. **However, in the Second Temple, since there was no one-cubit partition [teraksin]^L 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^N area of the Sanctuary, therefore the Sages of the time prepared two curtains^H to enclose this space of uncertain status.**

תְּנוּ רַבְנָא: בֵּין הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְמִנְרַת הַיָּה מְהֵלָּךְ, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, רַבִּי מֵאִיר אָמַר: בֵּין שְׁלֻחָן לְמִזְבֵּחַ. וְיֵשׁ אֲמָרִים: בֵּין שְׁלֻחָן לְכֹתֵל. מֵאֵן יֵשׁ אֲמָרִים? אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הֵיא, דְאָמַר: פִּתְחָא בְּצַפּוֹן קָאֵי.

S 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.

וּרְבִי יְהוּדָה אָמַר לֵךְ: פִּתְחָא בְּדָרוֹם קָאֵי, וּרְבִי מֵאִיר כְּמֵאן סְבִירָא לֵיהּ? אִי כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סְבִירָא לֵיהּ – גִּיעוּל כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, אִי כְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי סְבִירָא לֵיהּ – גִּיעוּל כְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי!

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.**

לְעוֹלָם כְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי סְבִירָא לֵיהּ, וְאָמַר לֵךְ: שְׁלֻחַנֵי מִזְבֵּחַ וְדָרוֹם מוֹנַחִין וּמִפְסָקָא לֵיהּ שְׁלֻחָן, וְלֹא מִתְעַיִל לֵיהּ.

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.**

וְאִיבְעִית אִימָא: לְעוֹלָם מִזְרַח וּמַעֲרָב מוֹנַחִין. וּמִשּׁוּם שְׂכִינָה לָא אֲוֹרַח אֲרַעָא

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

NOTES

This applies only in the Tabernacle – הֲנִי מִיָּלִי בְּמִשְׁכַּן – 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 – אִי כְּלַפְנֵי אִי בְּלַחוּץ – *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 Ari*).

How were the tables arranged – שְׁלֻחַנֵי הַיָּה מוֹנַחִין – 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 Sanc-

tuary, like the other sacred vessels. The debate here concerns the position of the other tables. Some commentaries point out that these extra tables were absent in the Second Temple, and the shewbread table stood alone in the Sanctuary, although there were an 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.