

2 Tammuz 5781  
June 12, 2021



Yoma Daf 62

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

It was stated: Rav Pappi said in the name of Rava: He sends away the first (of the two sets). Rav Shimi said in the name of Rava: He sends away the last.

The *Gemora* asks: It is reasonable according to Rav Shimi in the name of Rava, who said he sends the last away - that is because with it (its counterpart), he completes the atonement, but what is the explanation behind the view of Rav Pappi in the name of Rava?

The *Gemora* answers: He holds like Rabbi Yosi, who says that the mitzvah (whenever there are two options before us) should be fulfilled with the first one.

The *Gemora* asks: Which view of Rabbi Yosi is referred to here? Shall I say it is Rabbi Yosi’s view in the case of the baskets, for we learned in a *Mishna*: There were three baskets, each of three se’ahs, in which they withdraw coins out of the (shekel) chamber, and on them were inscribed (the letters) Alef, Beis, Gimmel. And it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi said: Why were Alef, Beis, Gimmel inscribed upon them? It was so that one may know which of them was withdrawn first (out of the shekel chamber), so as to use it first, for the mitzvah applies to the first!

The *Gemora* rejects this, for perhaps it is because at the time when the first is to be used, the others are not ready for use (for they were not yet removed)?

Rather, we refer to the view of Rabbi Yosi regarding the pesach sacrifice, for it has been taught in a *braisa*: If one set aside his pesach sacrifice and it became lost, and he set aside another one in his place, and then the first was found again, so that both are before him, then he may offer up whichever he wants; these are the words of the Sages. Rabbi Yosi, however, says: It is a mitzvah to use the first, but if the second is better than the first, then he may offer it. (62a1)

#### **WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HOTZIU LO**

MISHNAH: The two he-goats of Yom Kippur are required to be alike in appearance, in height, in value, in having been bought at the same time. But even if they are not alike, they are valid. If one was bought one day and the other the following day, they are valid.

If one of them died – if it occurred before the lot was cast, another one is bought for the second one; but if it occurred after the lot was cast, another pair must be brought and the lots cast for them over again. If the one that was for Hashem died, he should say as follows: let this one which the lot for Hashem has fallen on stand in its stead. And if the one that was cast for Azazel died, he should say: let this one which the lot for Azazel has fallen on stand in its stead. The second one is left to graze until it becomes blemished when it is to be sold and its value goes to towards voluntary communal offerings, for a communal chatas offering must not be

left to die (like the halachah is by other chatas offerings which cannot be offered). Rabbi Yehudah says: It is left to die.

Even more so did Rabbi Yehudah say: If the blood of the (*chatas*) goat spilled, the goat which was to be sent away is left to die (*for it is permanently rejected; two new goats must be chosen*); if the goat which was to be sent away died, the blood of the other one must be spilled out. (62a2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *And he shall take two he-goats*. Now, the minimum of he-goats is two; why then is 'two' mentioned? It is to indicate that the two be alike. From where do we know that even if the two are not alike, they are nevertheless valid? Therefore the verse states: 'He-goat,' 'he-goat' (a second time), which is inclusive.

The *Gemora* asks: Now, the reason they are valid (even if they are not alike) is only that the Torah expressly includes it, but had the Torah not done so, one would have assumed that they are invalid. From where would we have derived this indispensability?

The *Gemora* answers: You might have thought that we say it is based upon the fact that 'two' is written three times.

The *Gemora* asks: But now that the Torah has written 'he-goat' twice, what is the purpose of writing 'two' three times?

The *Gemora* answers: One applies to appearance, the other to height, and the third to value. (62b1)

The *Gemora* notes: It has been similarly taught in connection with the lambs of the *metzora*: *And he shall*

*take two lambs*. Now, the minimum of lambs is two; why then is 'two' mentioned? It is to indicate that the two be alike. From where do we know that even if the two are not alike, they are nevertheless valid? Therefore the verse states: '*lamb*,' '*lamb*' (a second time), which is inclusive.

Now the reason is only that the Torah expressly includes it, but had the Torah not done so, one would have assumed that they are invalid; from where, asks the *Gemora*, do we assume this indispensability?

The *Gemora* answers: You might have thought that since it is written, '*this shall be [the law]*' (everything must be done exactly as stated).

The *Gemora* asks: But now that the Torah has said: '*lamb*,' '*lamb*,' what purpose does '*this shall be*' serve?

The *Gemora* answers: That refers to the rest of the laws of the *metzora*. (62b1)

The *Gemora* notes: A *Baraisa* was similarly taught in connection with the (birds of) the *metzora*: *Birds*; now the minimum of birds is two. Why then is 'two' mentioned? It is to indicate that the two be alike. And from where do we know that even if they be not alike, they are valid? Therefore the Torah states: '*Birds*,' '*birds*,' which is inclusive.

Now the reason then is that the Torah expressly includes it, but had the Torah not included it, one would have assumed that they are invalid. From where would we have derived this indispensability?

The *Gemora* answers: You might have thought that since it is written, '*this shall be [the law]*' (everything must be done exactly as stated).



The *Gemora* asks: But now that the Torah has said: 'bird,' what purpose does 'this shall be' serve?

The *Gemora* answers: That refers to the rest of the laws of the *metzora*. (62b1 – 62b2)

The *Gemora* asks: If so (that we expound the word 'two' in such a manner), in the case of the tamid offerings, let us make a similar deduction: 'Lambs,' 'lambs,' since the minimum of lambs is two, why does the Torah state: 'two'? It is to indicate that they shall be alike. And from where do we know that even if they are not alike they are valid? Therefore the verse states: 'lamb,' 'lamb' (a second time), which is inclusive. But as far as the preferred mitzvah, is it indeed required that the lambs shall be alike (where such a requirement is not found anywhere)?

The *Gemora* answers: Here we need it (the word 'two') for that which has been taught in a *Baraisa*: *Two for the day*, i.e., against the day (the rays of the sun; not in the shade). You say 'against the day,' but perhaps it really means, the daily obligation? When it says: *The one lamb shall you offer in the morning, and the other lamb shall you offer in the afternoon*, behold the daily obligation is already stated; therefore, how do I apply the words: 'two for the day'? Against the day. How is that? The tamid morning offering was slaughtered by the northwestern corner (of the Altar), on the second ring, whereas that of the afternoon was slaughtered by the northeastern corner, on the second ring. [To the north of the Altar were twenty-four rings, six rows of four each, at which they slaughtered the animal offerings. The animals were securely tied on these rings before slaughtering. When the morning sacrifice was slaughtered on the western side, the light of the sun poured freely in (clearing the long shadow cast by the

tall eastern wall of the Courtyard), just as in the afternoon, when the sacrifice was slaughtered on the eastern side, the rays of the sun coming from the southwestern part of the sky, were unimpeded. Tosfos suggests that they used the second ring, rather than the first in order to prevent the animal from polluting the Altar with excrements.]

The *Gemora* notes: But the mussaf sacrifices of Shabbos certainly must be alike. (62b2 – 62b3)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If one slaughtered the two he-goats of Yom Kippur outside the Courtyard before the lots were cast, then he is liable in respect of both; if, however, (he slaughters them) after the lot was cast, then he is liable in respect of the one cast 'for Hashem,' but exempt in respect of the one cast 'for Azazel.' [One is only liable for slaughtering a sacrifice outside the Courtyard if the animal was eligible to be slaughtered as a valid sacrifice inside of the Courtyard.]

The *Gemora* asks: before the lots were cast, then he is liable in respect of both; but what sacrifice are they fit for?

Rav Chisda answered: Each of them is fit to be offered up as the (mussaf) he-goat performed outside (in the Courtyard).

The *Gemora* asks: But why is it not considered fit to be offered up as the he-goat performed within (the Sanctuary)? Presumably, it is because it still lacks the casting of the lot? But then it ought to be unfit to be used as the (mussaf) he-goat performed outside (in the Courtyard), for the reason that it still lacks the other services of the Day (and it would be invalid if performed out of sequence)?



The *Gemora* answers: Rav Chisda holds: One may not call the absence of any functions due on the same day as being 'premature.' (62b3)

Ravina said: Now that Rav Chisda said that the absence of the casting of the lot has the same significance as the absence of an action, then in view of what Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: A shelamim, which has been slaughtered before the doors of the Temple have been opened, are invalid, as it is written: *And he shall slaughter it at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting*, i.e., at the time when it is open, but not when it is closed; if someone had slaughtered them outside before the doors of the Temple had been open, he would be exempt, because the lack of opening is like the lack of an action. (62b3 – 63a1)

#### INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

##### ***Original, or Substitute? How to Choose?***

The *Gemora* states that if one designated an animal for a Korban Pesach and it got lost and he chose another one and subsequently the first one was found, he should use the first animal. However, if the second one is of a superior quality, he should bring that one.

Sheorim Metzuyanim b'halachah proposes according to this a new *halacha*. If one was given the privilege to serve as the *chazan* on the Yomim Noraim or to blow the shofar and he fell sick, so they chose a substitute, and then on Yom Tov became better, it should be up to the congregation as to which one is considered the '*muvchar*.' (Perhaps, he says, it should be decided through a lottery.)

The Yerushalmi also learns that if there are two animals

and one is a fatter animal, however the other looks better, the fatter animal should be chosen.

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### ***No Two Snowflakes...***

It is learned in the Mishnah that both goats should have the same appearance.

Ritva says that even though it is impossible for two animals to be precisely the same, like it is stated in Yerushalmi that even two grains of wheat will not be exactly alike, nevertheless, they should try for them to be as similar as possible.

Tosfos Yeshonim says that two people cannot appear the same as the *Gemora* in Sanhedrin states, however animals could be similar.

Rashi in Sukkah says that even apples on a tree cannot be the same as another.