



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Is a dead bull called a bull?

Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha challenges Rabbi Ami, who says that the word “bull” doesn't include a dead one, from the verse which says that “he must remove the whole bull [brought on a kohen gadol's error] outside of the camp,” even though the bull is dead at that point.

The Gemora answers that the verse is only teaching that everything left from the bull (i.e., the whole body) must be taken out.

The Gemora challenges Rabbi Ami from the verse about the Yom Kippur sacrifices, which states that he must remove the chatas bull and the chatas goat, even though they are slaughtered at that point.

Rav Pappa says that all agree that the carcass of an animal (body, skin, and innards) are still referred to as “the animal,” but they differ about whether the animal's blood is included.

Rav Ashi supports the position that the blood is included, from the verse which states that Aaron will enter the kodosh kadashim (on Yom Kippur) with a bull, which means the blood of the bull, and not literally a bull. Even though the bull is slaughtered when he enters, its blood is still called “the bull.”

The Gemora explains the verse to mean that in order to enter, he must bring a live bull as a sacrifice. (50a1)

Is the bull communal or individual?

The Gemora asks: Why don't we resolve the question regarding what to do if the kohen gadol died after he slaughtered the bull by considering it a case of a chatas whose owner (the kohen gadol) died, which must be put to death?

Ravin bar Rav Ada told Rava that his students quoted Rav Amram saying that the bull is considered a communal sacrifice, which is not put to death.

He proved this statement by citing a Mishna in which Rabbi Meir says that the kohen gadol's bull on Yom Kippur, his chavitin mincha offering each day, and a Pesach sacrifice, are individual's sacrifices, and yet override Shabbos, implying that the other opinion in the Mishna says that these are communal sacrifices.

Rava deflected this proof, since the Mishna continues with Rabbi Yaakov's statement that the bull offered for a communal error, a goat offered for a mistaken communal idolatry, and the chagigah offering, are communal sacrifices, and yet do not override Shabbos, which would imply that the other opinion considers these individual sacrifices.



This implication is incorrect, since the sacrifices for communal errors are definitely communal ones, indicating that we cannot make such inferences from the statements in this Mishna.

Rather, we must say that both Rabbi Yaakov and Rabbi Meir are simply challenging the rule of the first part of the Mishna, that a communal sacrifice overrides Shabbos, while an individual one does not.

Rabbi Meir was citing counterexamples of individual ones which do override Shabbos, while Rabbi Yaakov was citing counterexamples of communal ones which do not override Shabbos.

Rather, the rule is that anything which has a set time overrides Shabbos, and anything else does not, regardless of whether it is communal or individual.

Abaye cites a braisa to challenge Rava's position that no one considers the kohen gadol's bull a communal sacrifice. The braisa cites Rabbi Yehuda saying that if a bull or goat of Yom Kippur or a goat of mistaken communal idolatry were lost and replaced, and then found, they must be put to death. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say that they left to graze until they develop a blemish, and then redeemed, with the proceeds buying a voluntary communal sacrifices, since a communal chatas is not put to death.

Rava deflects this by saying that the bull in the braisa is referring to the chatas bull of a communal error, which is a communal sacrifice.

Abaye rejects this, since the braisa says it is "of Yom Kippur," but Rava deflects this by saying that that phrase refers only to the goat, which is communal.

Abaye cites another version of the braisa which explicitly lists the bull of Yom Kippur, and Rava deflects it by saying that Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon's statement should be amended to say that a *shared* chatas (like the bull, which atones for all kohanim) is not put to death.

The Gemora asks: How does this help, as either way, we have an opinion that it is a chatas which is not put to death, and answers that this does refute Rava's position, but the distinction teaches that if all kohanim sinned based on an erroneous ruling, they do not bring their own communal chatas, as other tribes would.

The Gemora cites another proof that there is an opinion that considers the Yom Kippur bull a communal sacrifice. Rabbi Elozar inquired whether Rabbi Meir, who considers this bull an individual sacrifice, says that it can cause another animal to be consecrated through *temurah* – *exchange*, or not, implying that others say that this bull is a communal sacrifice.

The Gemora deflects this by saying that it only implies that others say that it is a shared sacrifice, but not a communal one. (50a1 – 50b1)

Temurah on the bull

The Gemora returns to discuss Rabbi Elozar's question, clarifying what he was asking.

He cannot be asking whether we determine the *temurah* status based on the one who consecrated the animal (the kohen gadol, an individual), or based on the one who it atones for (the kohanim, who are a group), since Rabbi Yochanan already taught that *temurah* is performed by the one being atoned for. Rather, he knew that it is determined by the one being atoned for, but his question was whether the kohanim receive atonement as a standard parties to the sacrifice, or only as an extension of the kohen gadol's atonement, making it akin to a sacrifice atoning for an individual, which can make *temurah*.

The Gemora tries to resolve this from a braisa. The braisa says that a sacrifice is stricter than *temurah*, since it applies to an individual and a community, it overrides Shabbos and impurity, and it can sanctify another animal through *temurah*. *Temurah* is stricter than a sacrifice, as it can take effect on an animal with a permanent blemish, and one cannot work the animal or take its wool, even through redemption, while such an animal consecrated for a sacrifice is not sanctified as a sacrifice, and one may redeem it, and then work it and take its wool.

The Gemora analyzes the sacrifice this braisa is referring to. If it is an individual one, it wouldn't override Shabbos or impurity, but if it's a communal one, *temurah* wouldn't apply.

Rather, the Gemora suggests that it refers to the bull of Yom Kippur, which overrides Shabbos and impurity, since it has a set time, but still makes *temurah*, since it is considered an individual sacrifice.

Rav Sheishes deflects this by saying that it refers to the ram brought by the kohen gadol on Yom Kippur, which was an individual sacrifice with a set time.

The Gemora says that this is a better explanation, as the bull of Yom Kippur doesn't fit well into the braisa, since its *temurah* isn't offered at all, as it is a *temurah* of a chatas, yet the braisa only says that it doesn't override Shabbos and impurity.

The Gemora deflects this by saying that the braisa is referring to *temurah* in general, not necessarily of this sacrifice.

The Gemora challenges this, as we can similarly say that the sacrifice in the braisa also refers to sacrifices in general, proving nothing about the bull.

The Gemora rejects this possibility since the braisa says that a sacrifice can never be designated on a permanently blemished animal, and if such a consecration is attempted, one can redeem it, and then work it and use its wool. If the braisa was referring to sacrifices in general, this would not be true, since the sanctity of the first born and ma'aser do take effect on permanently blemished animals, and when they are redeemed, one may not work them or use their wool.

Rather, the braisa refers to *temurah* in general, since all *temurah*'s share the attributes listed, but the sacrifice must refer to one in particular, since they don't all share the same attributes about blemished animals. (50b1 – 51a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Partners without a Shavah Perutah

The Minchas Chinuch (325) quotes Rashi that whenever a mitzva mandates לכם - it has to be yours, if one owns less than a פרוטה, it is also lacking לכם. He asks that according to that, how will people fulfill the mitzva of ערבה on Sukkos when each stem is valued as less than a פרוטה? (Tell that to our Esrog dealers!!!!) It is answered that Rashi did not intend to say that something can't be yours if you own in it less than a פרוטה. Rashi holds that to be considered a *partner* with others, you must possess at least a פרוטה. This is evident from a Ritva in Avoda Zara and in Sefer Tal Torah.

A question is asked on this Ritva from a Gemora in Kidushin which states that all of Klal Yisroel were considered partners in one קרבן פסח even though they did not have a פרוטה? מאי? Sefer איש לב, he answers based on a Tosfos on our daf. The Gemora states that the פר of the kohen is not deemed a korban of partners, for the atonement from this korban only *hovers* over the other kohanim and therefore it is judged to be a korban of an individual (and one can make תמורה from it). Tosfos asks from a Gemora in Zevachim that rules on a korban from two sons who inherited it from their father, that it is considered a קרבן שותפין, even though a יורש only receives atonement in the form of מקופיא - hovering over them? Tosfos answers that when everyone has an equal share in the כפרה, even if it's only a minor one, they are considered partners, however by the פר of the kohen gadol, he is considered the full owner for he receives atonement בקביעותא and therefore the other kohanim are not regarded as partners. This is why all of Klal Yisroel can be considered partners, for they all have an equal share.

DAILY MASHAL

Timna, the Concubine of Esav

Rashi states that there are five korban טאות that have a דין of מיתה on them. The Ritva brings from a פסיקתא that an acronym to remember them by is ותמנע.

חטאת	ולד	-	ו
תמורה		-	ת
בעליה	מתה	-	מ
הבעלים	נתכפרו	-	נ
שנתה	עברה	-	ע

was the concubine of עשו. Perhaps we can say based on a Gemora in סנהדרין. She was a daughter of a king and wanted to convert and the עשו did not accept her. She went and married עשו proclaiming that it is preferable to be the maidservant of this great nation rather than being a princess in a lowly nation. It is her name that we utilize to illustrate these korbanos which are possul and invalidated and results in death, yet they are still regarded as a korban.

Floating or Circling?

The classical pshat in the kohanim reciving an atonement only מקופיא is that it is floating or hovering over the korban and not an actual כפרה. Rabbeinu Chananel learns it in a different way. He states that מקופיא is derived from the word הקפה - circle or surround. Therefore he learns that the kohanim are only considered partners from the time of ויודיו - confession, when they all gather around to hear it. It comes out that after the ויודיו, the kohen gadol would certainly not be allowed to make a תמורה from it, because by then everyone would be considered the בעלים.