

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

25 Tammuz 5770

Sh'vuos Daf 10

July 7, 2010

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"h.

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

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Atonement of the Goats

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Meir says: All the goats atone equally for impurity with respect to the Sanctuary and sacrificial food (*it atones for cases when there was no awareness in the beginning but there was at the end, and where there was no awareness in the beginning and the end, and for cases when a tavor person ate sacrificial food*).

Rabbi Chama the son of Rabbi Chanina said: What is Rabbi Meir's source? The verse could have said: "a goat," but it said: "and a goat"; all the goats are compared with each other. The letter "vav" -- "and" adds to the preceding subject.

It was at first assumed that each is deduced from the one next to it, but that cannot be, for Rabbi Yochanan said: In the entire Torah - a law may be derived by analogy from another law which has itself been derived by a different analogy, except in the case of sacred offerings, where a law may not be derived by analogy from another law which has itself been derived by a different analogy.

The *Gemora* answers: This is not a difficulty, for they may all be derived from the first one.

The *Gemora* asks: Granted, in every case where it is written: "and a goat," but in the case of *Shavuos* and *Yom Kippur*, where "and a goat" is not written, how can we derive this *halachah*?

The *Gemora* answers: It is as Rabbi Yonah taught: It is written: *These you shall offer to Hashem in your festivals*. All the festivals are compared with each other.

The *Gemora* asks: But *Rosh Chodesh* is not a Festival!?

The *Gemora* answers: *Rosh Chodesh* is also called a Festival, as Abaye said: Tammuz of that year (*the second year in the Wilderness*) was made into a full month (*of thirty days*), as it is written: *He has called an appointed occasion (Festival) against me to crush my young men*.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Meir concedes that the inner goat does not atone the atonement of the others, and the others do not atone its atonement (*which is: suspension of punishment for a case of awareness in the beginning but not at the end, and a complete atonement for deliberate sins involving the Mikdash and kodesh*). It does not atone the atonement of the others, for the verse says *one*. This implies that the inner goat only provides one type of atonement, and not two. The others do not atone its atonement, for the verse says: *once a year*. This implies that the atonement of the inner goat only happens once a year.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* in support of this statement: For a case where there was no awareness either at the beginning or at the end, and for a case where there is no awareness at the beginning but there was awareness at the end, and for a *tavor* person who ate sacred foods, the Festival goats and the *Rosh Chodesh* goats and the outer goat offered on *Yom Kippur* provide atonement; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The inner goat, however, he omits, and its atonement he also omits.

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon used to say: The *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone for *tavor* people who ate sacrificial food which became *tamei*; [*those of the Festivals atone for those who had no awareness either in the beginning or in the end*. The *Yom Kippur* goats atone for

those who had no awareness in the beginning but became aware afterwards].

The *Gemora* asks: It is understandable that the *Rosh Chodesh* goats do not atone for that which the Festival goats atone for, since the verse says: *the sin*. It can bear one sin, but not two. But let the Festival goats atone for that which the *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone for!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is written: *it provides forgiveness*. This indicates that it provides forgiveness for that sin, but no other offering will provide forgiveness for that sin.

The *Gemora* asks: It is understandable that the Festival goats do not atone for that which the *Yom Kippur* goats atone for, since the verse says: *once a year*. This implies that the atonement of the inner goat only happens once a year. But let the *Yom Kippur* goat atone for that which the Festival goats atone for!?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse says *one* (regarding the inner goat). This implies that the outer goat only provides one type of atonement, and not two.

The *Gemora* asks: But the verse is written with respect of the inner goat (*not the outer one*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is written (*by the outer goat*): Besides the *chatas* of *Yom Kippur* (referring to the inner goat). We therefore compare the two to each other.

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah said in the name of Rabbi Shimon: [*The Rosh Chodesh goats atone for tahor people who ate sacrificial food which became tamei; those of the Festivals surpass them, for they atone for tahor people who ate sacrificial food which became tamei, and for those who had no awareness either in the beginning or in the end. The Yom Kippur goats surpass them, for they atone for tahor people who ate sacrificial food which became tamei, and for those who had no awareness either in the beginning or in the end, and for those who had no awareness in the beginning but became aware afterwards.*]

The *Gemora* asks: What is the difference between the two? The *Rosh Chodesh* goats do not atone for that for which the Festival goats atone for because it is written: *the sin*. It can bear one sin, but not two. Then let the Festival goats also not atone for that for which the *Rosh Chodesh* goats atone for, because it is written: *it provides forgiveness*. This indicates that it provides forgiveness for that sin, but no other offering will provide forgiveness for that sin!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon does not agree with that (*the "it" one*) exposition.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the difference between the two? The Festival goats do not atone for that for which the *Yom Kippur* goat atones for, because the verse says: *once a year*. This implies that the atonement of the inner goat only happens once a year (*and we compare this goat to the outer goat as well*). Then let the *Yom Kippur* goat also not atone for that for which the Festival goats atone for, for the verse says *one*. This implies that the inner goat only provides one type of atonement, and not two (*and we compare this goat to the outer goat as well*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon does not agree with that (*the "one"*) exposition.

The *Gemora* asks: Why does he not agree with it? Is it not because it is written in connection with the inner goat, and not the outer one? If this is so, then let the Festival goats also atone for that for which the *Yom Kippur* goat atones for, because *once a year* is written in connection with the inner goat, and not the outer one?

The *Gemora* answers: In truth, the exposition of *once a year* is justifiable to him (*and we can then compare the two goats to each other*), but here it is different, for the verse says: *And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once a year* — the horns of the Inner Altar is where we can expound to say that it atones one atonement and not two atonements, but with reference to the outer goat, we may say that it atones even for two atonements. (10a - 10b)

Deconsecrating

Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The daily offerings (*those purchased with the half-shekel contributions from this year*) which were not necessary for the community (*for extra lambs were bought just in case the others had a blemish*) are redeemed even if they are unblemished. [*They could not be used for the following year; accordingly, they could be redeemed in order to make them usable. They were redeemed with unconsecrated money and the money is added to the Temple treasury collection, and used to plate the Holy of Holies. These lambs would then be purchased with the new half-shekel contributions, and used as offerings for the next year.*]

Rabbah sat and related this law. Rav Chisda said to him: Who will heed you and Rabbi Yochanan, your teacher? Where has the sanctity in them departed! [*Any animal that has acquired physical sanctity cannot be redeemed without having a disqualifying blemish!?*]

Rabbah replied to him: And do you not hold that we do not say: "where has the sanctity in them departed"? For it was taught in a *Mishna*: The remainder of the incense - what was

done with it (*in order to make it usable for the next year*)? The wages of the workmen (*who prepared the incense*) were allocated (*from the half-shekels in the Temple treasury; and the money was deconsecrated when it was given to them*), and the extra incense was deconsecrated by exchanging it for the worker's money, and (*the extra incense was*) given to the workmen as their wages, and was then re-purchased (*from them*) with the new donations (*and now could be used for the next year*). Now why should this be allowed? Let us say: "where has the sanctity in them departed"?

Rav Chisda replied to him: You ask from incense! Incense is different, because it only has a monetary sanctity (*and not a physical one; it therefore can be redeemed*).

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

CHECKING ANIMALS FOR BLEMISHES BEFORE THEY ARE SANCTIFIED

brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim
daf@dafyomi.co.il <http://www.dafyomi.co.il>

Ulla says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that animals designated to be used as daily offerings which are no longer needed by the community may be redeemed, even though they possess no blemish.

RASHI explains that these animals were bought from the public funds. The *Mishna* in Erchin (13a) teaches that there must never be less than six sheep that have been examined and found to be free of blemishes in the Lishkas ha'Tela'im (*the room in the Beis ha'Mikdash where the sheep for the Korbanos are kept*). Rashi explains that once Rosh Chodesh Nisan arrives, no *korban* bought with the money of the previous year may be offered. Therefore, every year, after the two *korbanos* of morning and evening Tamid of the last day of Adar are offered, at least four sheep are leftover which the no longer may be offered. Ulla says that these animals may be redeemed.

The *Gemora* in Erchin (13b) explains that the reason why there must always be at least six examined sheep in the Lishkas ha'Tela'im is the law that requires that the *korban tamid* be examined four days before it is slaughtered.

It seems that there should be a way to avoid having any consecrated sheep leftover at the end of the year. The examinations could be performed on ordinary Chulin animals before Rosh Chodesh Nisan. Afterwards, when Rosh Chodesh arrives, those animals could be bought with the Hekdesh money of the new year and be consecrated as *korbanos* for the next year. Why was this method not

utilized to prevent having four consecrated sheep leftover every year?

The **TUREI EVEN** in Megilah (29b, DH k'Man) answers that it is apparent from various Gemaras (and from Rashi here) that the law requires that the examinations must be done specifically after the animal has been consecrated as a *korban*, and thus they must be bought from the previous year's money before they are examined. Accordingly, it would not help to check the animals while they are still Chulin. The Turei Even adds that although it is known in advance that these four sheep will not be able to be offered once Rosh Chodesh Nisan arrives, the Chachamim decreed that every day, without exception, there must be six sheep in the Lishkas ha'Tela'im. (See Menachos 49b.)

However, the **MITZPEH EISAN, CHAZON ISH** (OC 124), and others maintain that the examinations may be performed while the animals are still Chulin. According to these opinions, why must there always be four consecrated sheep leftover at the end of the year?

The **YOSEF DA'AS** suggests an answer based on the words of the **RITVA** here. The Ritva asks, why did they not take two sheep on Erev Rosh Chodesh Nisan from the old money, borrow four sheep for the next day, and afterwards pay them back from the new money? He answers that the treasurers were not accustomed to taking merely six sheep at a time, because of the principle that "there is no poverty in the place of wealth" (in the Beis ha'Mikdash), and everything was done in abundance. Therefore, the treasurers would take many sheep at one time for the majority of the year, so that they could fulfill later the Mitzvah of taking the "one, special sheep" morning and evening for the *korban tamid* (see Megilah 28a). Afterwards, they would place six sheep in the special room reserved for the sheep that would be offered during the subsequent days.

Accordingly, although sheep *could* be borrowed for the next year, examined while Chulin, and then afterwards consecrated, this procedure would conflict with the practice of consecrating many sheep at one time.