

אֶפִּילוּ תַעֲמַא רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן הוּא, שְׂאִינִי
הֵכָא דְכְּתִיב 'אַחַת'.

The Gemara rejects this contention. Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yonatan, it remains possible to explain its ruling, since it is different here, as it is written “once” (Exodus 30:10), which indicates that there must be one act of sprinkling and not two. Consequently, the High Priest must mix the blood to ensure that there is only one presentation.

תַּנִּיא דְלֵא בְּשׁוּנוּיָין: 'וְלִקַּח מִדָּם הַפָּר
וּמִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר" – שְׂיֵהִיו מְעוֹרְבִין,
דְּבַרֵי רַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּהּ.

The Gemara comments: It was taught in a *baraita* contrary to our response, but in accordance with the initial assumption: “And he shall go out to the altar that is before the Lord, and make atonement for it; and he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat, and put it on the corners of the altar round about” (Leviticus 16:18). This verse teaches that the blood of the bull and the goat should be mixed. This is the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya.

Perek V
Daf 58 Amud a

NOTES

Once a year – אחת בשנה: Since Rabbi Yoshiya maintains that the blood of the two animals is sprinkled together, what does he learn from the word “once”? His answer is that other *halakhot* are derived from this term, as explained in tractate *Shevuot* (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

Placed one bowl inside a second bowl – הניח מוקק: Some commentaries add that the High Priest must nullify the outer vessel in favor of the inner one, as the Gemara’s comment that one cannot nullify another person’s foot indicates that nullification is required (*Me’iri*). *Tosafot* note that there is another issue involved here, namely the question of whether or not this is an appropriate manner of collecting blood. This question is also discussed in relation to a different issue in tractate *Sukka*, although it is possible that there is a difference between the *halakhot* of offerings and other mitzvot in this regard.

HALAKHA

Placed one bowl inside a second bowl – הניח מוקק: If a priest put one bowl inside another bowl and collected the blood that way, it is valid, as one type of an object does not interpose for another object of the same type (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 1:21).

רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן אוֹמֵר: מִזֶּה בִּפְנֵי עֲצָמוֹ,
וּמִזֶּה בִּפְנֵי עֲצָמוֹ. אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּהּ:
וְהֲלֵא כִּבֵּר נֶאֱמַר "אַחַת"!

Rabbi Yonatan says: He presents from this one, the bull’s blood, by itself, and he presents from that one, the goat’s blood, by itself and does not mix them. Rabbi Yoshiya said to him: But wasn’t it already stated: “And Aaron shall make atonement upon its corners once a year;” with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement” (Exodus 30:10), which indicates that the High Priest does not present twice?

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: וְהֲלֵא כִּבֵּר נֶאֱמַר
"מִדָּם הַפָּר וּמִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר". אִם בֵּן
לְמֵה נֶאֱמַר "אַחַת" – לוֹמַר לְךָ אַחַת
וְלֹא שְׁתֵּימִם מִדָּם הַפָּר, אַחַת וְלֹא
שְׁתֵּימִם מִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר.

Rabbi Yonatan said to him: But wasn’t it already stated: “Of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat” (Leviticus 16:18), which teaches that each set of sprinklings must be performed by itself? If so, why is “once” stated? This verse comes to tell you that he must perform the rite once and not perform two sets of sprinklings from the blood of the bull; and likewise he must perform the rite once and not perform two sets of sprinklings from the blood of the goat. From the blood of each of the animals, the High Priest presents only one set of sprinklings. This shows that Rabbi Yoshiya and Rabbi Yonatan indeed disagree with regard to this issue.

תַּנִּיא אִידָךְ: 'וְלִקַּח מִדָּם הַפָּר וּמִדָּם
הַשְּׂעִיר" – שְׂיֵהִיו מְעוֹרְבִין זֶה בְּזֶה.
אֵתָּה אוֹמֵר שְׂיֵהִיו מְעוֹרְבִין זֶה בְּזֶה
אוֹ אֵינִי אֵלֶּא מִזֶּה בִּפְנֵי עֲצָמוֹ וּמִזֶּה
בִּפְנֵי עֲצָמוֹ? תִּלְמוּד לֹא מֵר: 'אַחַת'.
וּסְתָמָא כְּרַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּהּ.

It was taught in another *baraita*: “And he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat” (Leviticus 16:18). This verse teaches that the blood of the bull and the goat should be mixed together. Do you say that they should be mixed together, or perhaps that is not the case; rather, he presents from this blood by itself and from that by itself? Therefore, the verse states: “Once.” The Gemara comments: And this unattributed *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiya, who said the two sets of blood are mixed, as stated in the mishna.

"נָתַן אֶת הַמְּלֵא בְּרִיקָן" וכו'. בְּעַא
מִינֵיהּ רַמִּי בַר חֲמָא מֵרַב חֲסָדָא:
הֲנִיחַ מוֹרֵק בְּתוֹךְ מוֹרֵק, וְקָבַל בּוֹ
אֶת הַדָּם, מֵהוּ? מִן בְּמִינוֹ חוּצָץ, אוֹ
אֵינִי חוּצָץ?

It was taught in the mishna that after the High Priest poured the bull’s blood into the goat’s blood, he placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl, to mix the blood well. Rami bar Hama raised a dilemma before Rav Hisda: What is the *halakha* if he placed one bowl inside a second bowl^{NH} and collected the blood in the inner bowl? Does one type of object mingled with another of its own type interpose, which would mean that the priest has not collected the blood himself, as the outer bowl interposed between him and the vessel? Or perhaps an object of one type does not interpose for another object of the same type, and therefore the two bowls are considered one object.

אָמַר לֵיהּ, תַּנִּיתוּהוּ: נָתַן אֶת הַמְּלֵא
בְּרִיקָן. מֵאֵי לָאוּ – הוֹשִׁיב מוֹרֵק מְלֵא
לְתוֹךְ מוֹרֵק רִיקָן?

Rav Hisda said to him: We have already learned the answer to this question in the mishna: He placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl. What, is it not correct to infer from this statement that he inserted the full bowl into the empty bowl?

לא, עירה מזרק מלא לתוך מזרק ריקון. הא תנא ליה רישא: עירה דם הפר לתוך דם השעיר! כדי לערבן יפה יפה.

תא שמע: היה עומד על גבי כלי או על גבי רגל חבירו – פסול. שאני רגל, דלא מצוי מבטיל ליה.

איכא דאמרי, הכי בעי מיניה: דרך שירות בכך או אין דרך שירות בכך? תא שמע, דתנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: "את כל כלי השרת אשר ישרתו בסם בקודש" שני כלים ושירות אחת.

בעא מיניה רמי בר חמא מרב חסדא: הניח סיב בתוך המזרק וקבל בו את הדם, מהו? מין בשאינו מינו חוצץ, או אינו חוצץ? כיון דמתחלה – לא חייץ, או דילמא לא שונא?

אמר ליה: תגניא, זולף והולך עד שמגיע לספוג. שאני מיא דקלישי.

איכא דאמרי, הכי פשט ליה: בדם – כשר, בקומץ פסול.

Rami bar Ḥama responded: **No**, it means that he poured the full bowl into an empty bowl. Rav Ḥisda said to him: But this statement is unnecessary, as the *tanna* of the mishna already taught the requirement to pour from one vessel into another in the first clause: **He poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the goat**. The subsequent phrase: He placed the full into the empty, must therefore refer to the placement of one vessel inside another. Rami bar Ḥama responded: No, it means that he pours the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl a second time **in order to mix them very well**. To this end, he pours from one vessel into the other before again pouring the mixture back into the first vessel, thereby mixing them thoroughly.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear** a solution to this question: If a priest performed the Temple service while he was **standing on top of a vessel,^{NH} or on the foot of another** priest, his service is **disqualified**, as the priest must stand directly on the floor of the Temple. The fact that the foot of another person is considered an interposition proves that one type serves as an interposition with regard to another object of the same type. The Gemara rejects this contention: **A foot is different, as he cannot nullify it**. The foot of another person cannot be considered nullified with respect to the priest's foot, but in the case of a vessel it is possible to say that one vessel is nullified in favor of another vessel.

Some say that Rami bar Ḥama did not refer to the issue of interposition at all. Rather, **this is the dilemma he raised before Rav Ḥisda: Is placing one vessel inside another vessel a proper manner of service; or is this not a proper manner of service**, and if one does so his service is disqualified? The Gemara answers: **Come and hear that which the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: "And they shall take all the service vessels, with which they serve in the Sanctuary"** (Numbers 4:12). This verse is referring to **two vessels and one service**, which indicates that this is a proper manner of service.

S Rami bar Ḥama raised another dilemma before Rav Ḥisda along the same lines: **What is the halakha if he placed bast,^B the material that grows around palm trees, inside the bowl,^H and collected the blood in the bowl through the bast**, such that the blood seeps through into the bowl? Does one **type of object mixed with another not of its own type interpose; or perhaps it does not interpose?** Could one say that **since the blood seeps through, it therefore does not interpose? Or perhaps this case is no different**, and as there is a foreign object in the vessel it is considered an interposition even if the blood seeps through.

Rav Ḥisda said to him in response: **We already learned** this matter with regard to sanctifying the purification waters, i.e., the water mixed with ashes of the red heifer. If a sponge was placed inside the container of water, the water in the sponge is disqualified and the priest may not sprinkle with it. How should he proceed? **He sprinkles from the water and continues until he reaches the sponge**. This shows that the presence of the sponge in the water container is not considered an interposition for the water in the container, despite the fact that it itself is unfit for the service. Rami bar Ḥama replied: This is no proof. **Water is different, as it is thin** and therefore it certainly seeps through the sponge and reaches the bowl; whereas the thicker blood will perhaps not seep into the fiber.

Some say that **this is how Rav Ḥisda resolved** the problem of placing the bast in the bowl for Rami bar Ḥama: In the case of the **blood it is valid**, as blood passes through, and the bast does not obstruct it. However, in the case of the **handful** of a meal-offering, which must be sanctified in a vessel immediately after the handful is taken, if he put bast in a vessel and placed the handful on top of it, **it is disqualified.^N** The reason is that the handful of a meal-offering consists of dough, which does not pass through the bast, and it is therefore considered a proper interposition.

NOTES

Standing on top of a vessel – עומד על גבי כלי – Just as the Temple vessels are sanctified, so too, the floor of the courtyard is sanctified. Just as there must be no barrier between the priest and the vessel, so too, there must not be a barrier between him and the floor.

In the case of the handful it is disqualified – בקומץ פסול – It is apparently obvious that the meal-offering is invalid in this case. One explanation is that since the flour of the meal-offering is very fine, one might have thought that perhaps it too will seep through the bast. The Gemara therefore points out that solid matter is not considered to seep through bast (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

HALAKHA

Standing on top of a vessel – עומד על גבי כלי – A priest performing the Temple service must stand on the floor. If something interposes between him and the ground, e.g., if he stands on top of a vessel, an animal, or another's foot, the service is disqualified (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 5:17).

He placed bast inside the bowl – הניח סיב בתוך המזרק – If the priest placed bast or any other absorbent fiber into the bowl and collected the blood in this manner, the service is valid, as fiber is hollow, and the blood will enter into the bowl without any interposition. However, if he did so for the handful of the meal-offering and took the handful from on top of the bast, the service is disqualified (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 1:21).

BACKGROUND

Bast – סיב – Bast is a soft, woody fiber obtained from stems of certain plants and used for textiles and ropes. These fibers, usually characterized by fineness and flexibility, are also known as soft fibers, distinguishing them from the coarser, less flexible fibers of the leaf. Bast from palm trees has been used since antiquity.



Bast of a palm tree

BACKGROUND

במקומו היה עומד ומחטא –



High Priest sprinkling the blood on the altar

Kidron River – נחל קדרון: On this map, the area of the Temple Mount is the large structure on the left-hand side. The Kidron River, which passes next to the wall of the Temple Mount, is the source of the Pool of Siloam. The sketch clearly shows that the wall of the Temple Mount stands above the slope of the river, and therefore the natural place for removing the spillage from the Temple was via the Kidron River.



Map of the Temple Mount and the Kidron River



Section of Kidron River

מתני' 'וַיֵּצֵא אֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֶשֶׁר לִפְנֵי ה' – זֶה מִזְבֵּחַ הַזָּהָב. הַתְּחִיל מִחֹטֵא וַיֵּרֵד. מֵהֵיכָן הוּא מֵתְחִיל – מִקֶּרֶן מִזְרָחִית צְפוֹנִית, צְפוֹנִית מֵעֶרְבִית, מֵעֶרְבִית דְּרוֹמִית, דְּרוֹמִית מִזְרָחִית. מְקוֹם שֶׁהוּא מֵתְחִיל בְּחֹטֵא עַל מִזְבֵּחַ הַחִיצוֹן מִשָּׁם הָיָה גוֹרֵם עַל מִזְבֵּחַ הַפְּנִמִּי.

רבי אליעזר אומר: במקומו היה עומד ומחטא.

וְעַל כּוֹלֵן הָיָה נוֹתֵן מִלְמַטָּה לְמַעְלָה, חוּץ מִזוֹ שֶׁהִיְתָה לְפָנָיו, שֶׁהִיָּה נוֹתֵן מִלְמַעְלָה לְמַטָּה. הַזֶּה עַל טְהוֹרוֹ שֶׁל מִזְבֵּחַ שְׁבַע פְּעָמִים. וְשִׁירֵי הַדָּם הָיָה שׁוֹפֵךְ עַל יְסוֹד מֵעֶרְבֵי שֶׁל מִזְבֵּחַ הַחִיצוֹן. וְשֶׁל מִזְבֵּחַ הַחִיצוֹן הָיָה שׁוֹפֵךְ אֶל יְסוֹד דְּרוֹמִי. אֵלּוֹ וְאֵלּוֹ מֵתְעַרְבִין בְּאַמָּה, וַיּוֹצֵאֵין לְנַחַל קְדְרוֹן, וּנְמַכְרִין לְגַנְנֵין לְזָבֵל וּמוֹעֵלִין בָּהֶן.

MISHNA It is stated: “And he shall go out to the altar that is before the Lord, and make atonement for it; and he shall take of the blood of the bull, and of the blood of the goat, and place it upon the corners of the altar round about” (Leviticus 16:18). This altar is the golden altar, since the outer altar is not before the Lord in the Sanctuary. He began to cleanse the altar, sprinkling the blood downward.^{NH} From where does he begin? He begins from the northeast corner, and proceeds to the northwest corner, and then to the southwest corner, and finally to the southeast corner. A way to remember this is: At the place where he begins sprinkling the blood for a sin-offering^H sacrificed on the outer altar, the southeast corner, there he finishes sprinkling the blood on the inner altar.

Rabbi Eliezer says: The priest would not circle the altar; rather, he stood in one place and sprinkled^B the blood from there. Since the altar was only one square cubit, he could sprinkle the blood on all four corners without moving.

And on all the corners he would present the blood from below upward, except for that corner that was directly before him,^N on which he would present the blood from above downward. He sprinkled blood on the pure gold of the altar^H seven times after clearing away the ashes. And he would pour the remainder of the blood on the western base of the outer altar. On a related topic, the mishna teaches that he would pour the remaining blood of an offering, after it was sprinkled, on the outer altar, on its southern base.^H These remainders of blood from the outer altar and those remainders of blood from the inner altar are mixed in the canal beneath the altar and flow out with the water used to rinse the area to the Kidron River.^{HB} This water was sold to gardeners for use as fertilizer. The gardeners paid for this water and thereby redeemed it from its sanctity. Failure to do so would render them guilty of misuse of consecrated property.

NOTES

התחיל מחטא – התחיל מחטא – He began to cleanse [meḥateh] downward – According to Rashi, meḥateh means descent, i.e., he sprinkles downward. However, most other commentaries maintain that meḥateh is simply a term for sprinkling, as stated explicitly in the Torah (see Leviticus 16:18), without any indication of the direction (see Ritva).

חוץ – Except for that corner that was directly before him – **מזו שהייתה לפניו** – He cannot sprinkle from below upward lest the blood enter the sleeve of his tunic, as stained priestly garments are unfit for the Temple service.

HALAKHA

הזאה על מזבח הזהב – The High Priest stands on the inner side of the golden altar, between the altar and the candelabrum, to the south of the altar. He circles the altar and sprinkles the corners beginning with the northeast corner, followed by the northwest, southwest, and southeast. On all the corners he presents the blood from the bottom to the top, except for the last sprinkling, which is on the corner closest to him. He performs this sprinkling from the top downward to avoid sullyng his garments. The Rambam rules here in accordance with the unattributed opinion in the mishna, which he maintains is the majority opinion (see Kesef Mishne as cited in the responsa of the Rashba, and Tosafot Yeshanim; Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Avodot Yom HaKippurim 4:2).

על טהורו של מזבח: The High Priest raked the ashes and coals aside until he exposed the gold of the altar. He sprinkled the mixed blood on the top of the altar on its south side and then poured the remainder of the blood on the west base of the outer altar (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Avodot Yom HaKippurim 4:2).

מקום שהוא – The place where he begins for a sin-offering – **מתחיל בחטאת** – The blood of a sin-offering is sprinkled on the altar as follows: The priest ascends the ramp and turns to his right. He first places blood on the southeast corner, then on the northeast one, continuing until he ends at the southwest corner (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Ma'aseh HaKorbanot 5:10).

היתר דם חטאת חיצונה – The remainder of the blood from a sin-offering on the outer altar – **שירי דם חטאת חיצונה** – The blood that remained from a sin-offering sacrificed on the outer altar was poured on its southern base (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Ma'aseh HaKorbanot 5:10).

מתערבין באמה ויוצאין לנחל קדרון – Those are mixed in the canal and flow out to the Kidron River – **מתערבין באמה ויוצאין לנחל קדרון** – The blood that was spilled on the base of the altar flowed from there into the Temple's drainpipes, where it was washed out with the cleansing water to the Kidron River. This blood-water mixture was sold to gardeners as fertilizer, and the money of the proceeds was consecrated. Any unlawful use of the blood constituted misuse of consecrated property. The Ra'avad maintains that this prohibition applies by rabbinic law (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Me'ila 2:1).

הזאה על מזבח הזהב – He sprinkled blood on the pure gold of the altar –

Northeast – מִזְרֵיט צְפוֹנִית: The commentaries note that Rabbi Yosei HaGelili's opinion is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei's claim that the entrance of the curtain is in the north. As the High Priest emerges from that side, he begins to sprinkle there. However, other commentaries maintain that Rabbi Yosei HaGelili disagrees with Rabbi Yosei (see *Tosafot Yeshanim* and the commentaries on Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:2).

גמ' תנו רבנן: "וַיֵּצֵא אֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ" מה תלמוד לומר? אמר רבי נחמיה: לפי שמצינו בפר הכבא על כל המצות, שבהן עומד חוץ למזבח ומזה על הפרוכת בשעה שהוא מזה, יכול אף זה כן –

GEMARA The Sages taught: "And he shall go out to the altar" (Leviticus 16:18). What is the meaning when the verse states this? Upon his exit, after sprinkling toward the curtain, the High Priest must necessarily reach the golden altar. Rabbi Neḥemya said: It is because we find with regard to the bull brought for a violation of all the mitzvot, i.e., the bull that must be brought in the event that the community errs with regard to any of the mitzvot, which is called the bull for an unwitting communal sin, that when the priest sprinkles toward the curtain he stands past the altar and sprinkles back toward the curtain; therefore, one might have thought that here, too, the rite should be performed in the same manner.

תלמוד לומר: "וַיֵּצֵא אֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ". היכן היה – לפני מן המזבח.

Therefore, the verse states: "And he shall go out to the altar." Where was he before? He was on the inner side of the altar, i.e., the western side, close to the curtain, when he sprinkled, not on the outer side of the altar.

תנא אידך: "לפני ה'" מה תלמוד לומר? אמר רבי נחמיה: לפי שמצינו בפר ושעיר של יום הכפורים שבהן עומד לפני מן המזבח ומזה על הפרוכת בשעה שהוא מזה, יכול אף זה כן –

It was taught in another *baraita*: With regard to the bull for an unwitting communal sin the verse states: "And he shall sprinkle seven times before the Lord in front of the curtain" (Leviticus 4:17). What is the meaning when the verse states: Before the Lord? Rabbi Neḥemya said: It is because we find with regard to the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur that when he sprinkles the High Priest stands on the inner side of the altar, close to the curtain, and sprinkles toward the curtain; therefore, one might have thought that here, too, in the case of the bull for an unwitting communal sin, it should be the same rite.

תלמוד לומר: "מזבח קטרת הסמים לפני ה' אשר באהל מועד." מזבח לפני ה', ואין בהן לפני ה'. הא ביצד – עומד חוץ למזבח ומזה.

Therefore, the verse states: "And the priest shall put the blood upon the corners of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the Tent of Meeting" (Leviticus 4:7). This verse teaches that the altar is before the Lord, but the priest is not before the Lord. How so? The priest stands on the outer side of the altar and sprinkles.

"התחיל מחטא ויורד וכו'." תנו רבנן: התחיל מחטא ויורד, מהיכן היה מתחיל – מקרן מזרחית דרומית, דרומית מערבית, מערבית צפונית, צפונית מזרחית, דברי רבי עקיבא. רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: מקרן מזרחית צפונית, צפונית מערבית, מערבית דרומית, דרומית מזרחית.

§ The mishna taught: He began to cleanse the altar, sprinkling the blood downward. The Sages taught in a *baraita*: He began to cleanse downward. From where would he begin? He would begin from the southeast corner of the altar, and from there he would turn to the southwest corner, onward to the northwest corner, and finally to the northeast corner. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: He began from the northeast¹ corner, from which he turned to the northwest corner, then to the southwest corner, and finished at the southeast corner.

מקום שרבי יוסי הגלילי מתחיל, שם רבי עקיבא פוסק. מקום שרבי עקיבא מתחיל, שם רבי יוסי הגלילי פוסק.

The Gemara notes: The place where the High Priest begins according to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, i.e., the northeast corner, there is where Rabbi Akiva says he ends; and the place where the High Priest begins according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, the southeast corner, there is where Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says he ends.

דכולי עלמא מיהא, בההוא קרן דפגע ברישא לא עביד, מאי טעמא? אמר שמואל: דאמר קרא "וַיֵּצֵא אֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ" – עד דנפיק מבוליה מזבח.

The Gemara asks: Everyone agrees, in any case, that he does not perform the service at the corner that he encounters first. Since the High Priest approaches the altar from the west side, the first corner he encounters is located on the west side. What is the reason for this? Shmuel said: The reason is that the verse states: "And he shall go out to the altar," which indicates that he does not begin until he goes out from the sacred area beyond the entire area of the altar. At this stage, he is no longer on the western side of the altar but on its eastern side.

ולרבי עקיבא, נקיף דרך ימין! לימא בדרמי בר יחזקאל קא מיפלגי,

The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, let him go around via the right. Since the High Priest is standing at the eastern side of the altar facing the west, the corner on his right is the northeast one. Let us say that they disagree with regard to the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel.

By right [*midina*] – מדינא: Some commentaries read this as *modina*, meaning: I concur in this regard (Rabbeinu Elyakim). The term *midina* can also be interpreted as: With this I agree.

דאמר רמי בר יחזקאל: ים שעשה שלמה עומד על שנים עשר בקר שלשה פונים צפונה ושלשה פונים ימה ושלשה פונים נגבה ושלשה פונים מזרחה והים עליהם מלמעלה וכל אחריהם ביתה. הא למדת שכל פינות שאותה פונה לא יהו אלא דרך דרך ימין למזרח. מר אית ליה דרמי בר יחזקאל, ומר לית ליה דרמי בר יחזקאל?

לא. דכולי עלמא אית להו דרמי בר יחזקאל, והכא בהא קא מפלגי; מר סבר: ילפינן פנים מחוץ, ומר סבר: לא ילפינן פנים מחוץ.

ורבי עקיבא: נהי דלא יליף פנים מחוץ, אי בעי – הכי נעביד, אי בעי – הכי נעביד! אמר לך רבי עקיבא: מדינא – בההוא קרן דפגע ברישא בההוא עביד ברישא, דאמר ריש לקיש: אין מעבירין על המצות.

ואמאי לא עביד – משום דכתיב "ויצא אל המזבח" – עד דנפיק מבוליה מזבח, ובין דיהיב בההוא קרן – הדר אתי לההוא קרן דאיתייב למיתב ברישא.

As Rami bar Yehezkel said: A verse describes the sea, the basin that Solomon built, in the following terms: "It stood upon twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, and three looking toward the west, and three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east; and the sea was set upon them above, and all their hinder parts were inward" (II Chronicles 4:4). From the direction in which the text lists the groups of oxen under the basin, you learn that all turns that you turn should be only to the right and to the east side. Let us say that this Sage, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, is of the opinion that the ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel, and this Sage, Rabbi Akiva, is of the opinion that the ruling is not in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, everyone is of the opinion that the ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Yehezkel, but here they disagree with regard to this matter: One Sage, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, holds: We derive the order of the rite inside the Sanctuary from the manner of the sprinkling on the outside: Just as the priest sprinkles on the corners of the outer altar in that order, he sprinkles similarly on the inner altar. And one Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds: We do not derive the order of the rite inside of the Sanctuary from the rite performed outside.

S The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, although he does not derive the inside from the outside, nevertheless if the High Priest wants, let him perform the rite in this manner, and if he wants, let him perform the rite in that manner. Why must he begin specifically at the southeast corner? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva could have said to you: Indeed, by rightⁿ he should begin sprinkling by that corner of the altar that he reaches first, as Reish Lakish said: One does not pass on an opportunity to perform mitzvot. If one has the chance to perform a mitzva, he should not put it off for later but should do it immediately.

And why does he not do so; why does the High Priest not begin the sprinkling on one of the western corners? This is due to that which is written: "He shall go out to the altar," meaning that he does not begin until he goes out from the area of the entire altar. And since he presents the blood at that corner on the outside of the altar, he then comes to that corner on the west side where he should have presented the blood first.

Perek V
Daf 59 Amud a

ואי בעית אימא: אי סבירא לן הקפה ברגל – דכולי עלמא לא פליגי דילפינן פנים מחוץ. והכא בהא קא מפלגי; מר סבר: הקפה ביד, ומר סבר: הקפה ברגל.

And if you wish, say instead: If we hold that the encircling is performed by foot, i.e., the priest walks around the inner altar, everyone agrees that we learn the method of sprinkling inside from the sprinkling outside. And here they disagree about this matter: One Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that the priest stands in his place and sprinkles on all the corners from there, which means his encircling is performed by hand; and one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that the encircling is done by foot.

ואי בעית אימא: דכולי עלמא הקפה ביד, והכא בהא קא מפלגי; מר סבר: ילפינן יד מרגל, ומר סבר: לא ילפינן.

And if you wish, say instead: Everyone agrees that the encircling was performed by hand, and here they disagree about this matter: One Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that we derive the halakhot of an encircling performed by hand from those of an encircling by foot, and therefore the ritual of the inner altar is the same as that of the outer altar. And one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that we do not derive the encircling performed by hand from the encircling done by foot.