

6 Tammuz 5781
June 16, 2021



Yoma Daf 66

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

Rather, said Rava, (the reason why R’ Yehudah maintains that the extra bull and the he-goat are left to die is because) the restriction is due to the fear of a mishap (that might happen with the animals if they were to remain alive), for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: Nowadays, one may neither consecrate anything, nor make erech vows, nor pledge a donation of an item to the Bais Hamikdash (lest someone come to benefit from them). If one did any of these, the items must be destroyed. If it is animal, it must be uprooted, and if it is clothing, it must be left to decompose, and if it is money or metal utensils, it must be thrown to the Dead Sea. What does “uprooted” mean? It means that we lock the door in front of it and it dies by itself (through starvation). [We see that we do not allow consecrated animals to remain alive.]

The *Gemora* asks: What kind of mishap are we concerned about? If it is a mishap that it might be offered up, that (concern) should then apply to all other cases of grazing animals as well? If it is a mishap in connection with shearing or working it, that (concern) should then apply to all other cases of grazing animals as well?

The *Gemora* answers: In truth, the mishap contemplated is that it might be offered up, but with those (that are sent to graze) which are not to be offered up, one is not preoccupied (and will not mistakenly offer them), whereas with this one, since it is to be offered up, he would be pre-occupied. (66a1 – 66a2)

The *Gemora* notes: Now, as to the question itself whether we are concerned for the possibility of a mishap, the Tannaim dispute this, for it was taught in one *Baraisa*: A pesach sacrifice which was not offered up on the first Pesach (the fourteenth of Nissan) may be offered up on the second (the

fourteenth of Iyar), and if not offered up on the second, may be offered up in the following year. And another *Baraisa* taught: It must not be offered up. Are they not disputing whether we are concerned for a mishap or not?

The *Gemora* explains the dispute differently: No, all agree that we are not apprehensive regarding a mishap; but here they are disputing in the matter at issue between Rebbe and the Sages (if an animal can still be less than a year old by the time the next Pesach arrives), and there is no difficulty, for one *Baraisa* is in accordance with Rebbe, whereas the other *Baraisa* follows the Sages.

The *Gemora* asks: But was it not taught in a *Baraisa*: The same applies to the money (which has nothing to do with Rebbe and the sages)!?

Rather, the *Gemora* concludes, infer from here that they indeed are disputing in regard to the fear of the mishap. (66a2)

MISHNAH: The *Mishnah* continues with the procedure of the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur: He then came to the Azazel goat and leans his two hands upon it and he made a confession. And this is what he would say: Please Hashem, Your people, the House of Israel have sinned inadvertently, sinned willfully and sinned rebelliously before You. Please Hashem! Please atone for the inadvertent sins, the willful sins and the rebellious sins which Your people, the House of Israel, have committed inadvertently, committed willfully and committed rebelliously before You, as it is written in the Torah of Moshe, Your servant, to say: *for on this day shall atonement be made for you, to purify you; from all your sins before Hashem shall you be purified.* And when the Kohanim

and the people standing in the Courtyard heard the Ineffable Name come forth from the mouth of the Kohen Gadol, they kneeled, prostrated themselves, and fell on their faces, and called out: Blessed be the Name of His glorious kingdom forever and ever!

They handed it (the Azazel goat) over to the one who was to lead it away. All were permitted to lead it away, but the Kohanim made it a definite rule, and they did not permit a non-Kohen to lead it. Rabbi Yosi said: It once happened that Arselah led it away, although he was a non-Kohen.

And they made a ramp for him, because of the Babylonians, who would pull its hair, saying to him: Take it and leave, take it and leave. (66a2 – 66a3)

The *Gemora* notes: But he (the Kohen Gadol) did not say (in his confession): “The sons of Aaron, Your holy people”. Which Tanna is of this opinion? Rabbi Yirmiyah said: This is not in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, for if it were in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, surely he said: They (the Kohanim) as well, obtain atonement thru the Azazel goat.

Abaye said: You might even say that it is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah: Are the Kohanim not included in ‘Your people, Israel’? (66a3)

The Mishnah had stated: They handed it (the Azazel goat) over to the one who was to lead it away. The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *And he (the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur) shall send it (the Azazel goat) away with a designated man; ‘man’* implies that also a non-Kohen is qualified; ‘designated’ (iti) implies that it should be someone who was designated for it; ‘iti’ – even on Shabbos, and ‘iti’ - even in *tumah*.

The *Gemora* notes the novelty of teaching that a non-Kohen is allowed to send it away; for you might have thought that since the term ‘atonement’ is written in connection with it (perhaps a Kohen is required); therefore he informs us otherwise. (66a3 – 66b1)

The Mishnah had stated: ‘Iti’ - even on Shabbos. For what law was this needed? Rav Sheishes said that this teaches us the law that if it (the Azazel goat) is sick, he may carry it on his shoulder (although it is “carrying” on Shabbos).

The *Gemora* asks: According to whose view is this? Seemingly, it is not according to Rabbi Nassan, for Rabbi Nassan said: A living being carries itself (and one who carries a living creature does not violate the melachah of “carrying”).

The *Gemora* answers: You may even say that this is in accordance with Rabbi Nassan, for when it is sick, it is different (for then, it will not support its own weight). (66b1)

Rafam remarked: This proves that the laws concerning *eruv* and transferring apply to *Shabbos* and do not apply to *Yom Kippur* (for otherwise, why would it be necessary to teach that the goat may be carried on Shabbos; if it may be carried on Yom Kippur, then it can be carried on Shabbos as well)! (66b1)

The *Baraisa* had stated: ‘Iti’ - even in *tumah*. For what law was this needed? Rav Sheishes said: It is teaching us that if he who is to carry it away became tamei, he may enter the Courtyard while tamei and carry it away. (66b1)

Rabbi Eliezer was asked: What about his carrying it on his shoulder (if it became sick)? He said: It (was so strong and healthy that it) could carry you and me.

They asked him: If he who is to take it away became sick, may he send it away through someone else? He replied: I and you shall be in peace! [We will never need to accompany the he-goat.]

They asked him: If he pushed it down and it did not die, must he go down after it and kill it? He said to them: *So may all your enemies go lost, O Hashem*. But the Sages said: If it became sick, he may carry it on his shoulder; if the one who was designated to send it became sick, he should send it through another person; if he pushed it down and it did not die, he shall go down and kill it. (66b1 – 66b2)

They asked Rabbi Eliezer: What about So-and-So in the World to Come? He replied: Perhaps you asked me about a different one'?

They asked him: What is the law regarding a shepherd saving the lamb from the lion? He said to them: Have you asked me only about the lamb? They responded: What is the law regarding the saving of the shepherd from the lion? He said to them: Have you asked me only about the shepherd?

They asked him: May a mamzer inherit his father? He replied: May he marry the wife of his brother in yibum (when the brother died without children)?

They asked him: May one plaster his house (or is there a decree that one must display sorrow for the destruction of the Temple)? He replied: May one plaster his grave?

The *Gemora* notes: His evasion was not due to his desire to divert them with word, but rather, it was because he never said anything that he had not heard from his teacher. (66b2)

A wise woman asked Rabbi Eliezer: Since with regard to the sin with the golden calf all were evenly associated, why wasn't the penalty of death the same?¹ — He answered her: There is no wisdom in woman except with the spindle. Thus also does Scripture say: And all the women that were wise-hearted did spin with their hands.²

It is stated: Rav and Levi are disputing in the matter. One said: Whoever sacrificed and burned incense died by the sword; whoever embraced and kissed [the calf] died the death [at the hands of Heaven]; whoever rejoiced in his heart died of dropsy. The other said: He who had sinned before witnesses and after receiving warning, died by the sword; he who sinned before witnesses but without previous warning, by death; and he who sinned without witnesses and without previous warning, died of hydrokan.

¹ Scripture mentions three forms of penalties: Some died by the sword, others by the plague, the rest by hydrokan – swelling of the stomach.

Rav Yehudah said: The tribe of Levi did not participate in the idolatry, as it is said: Then Moshe stood in the gate of the camp. Ravina was sitting and reporting this teaching, whereupon the sons of Rav Pappa bar Abba objected to Ravina: Who said of his father and of his mother: 'I have not seen him, etc.'? — 'His father', that is the father of his mother, an Israelite; 'brother', the brother of his mother, an Israelite; 'sons', that means the sons of his daughter [which she had] from an Israelite. (66b3)

The Mishnah had stated: And they made a ramp for him etc. Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said: These were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, and because they [the residents of Eretz Yisroel] hated the Babylonians, they called them [the Alexandrians] by their [the Babylonians'] name. It was taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Yehudah said: They were not Babylonians, but Alexandrians. — Rabbi Yosi said to him: May your mind be relieved even as you have relieved my mind! (66b3)

The Mishnah had stated: Take it and leave! It was taught in a Baraisa: [They would say:] "Why is this he-goat delaying when the sins of the generation are many?" (66b3)

DAILY MASHAL

"Ki ba'yom ha'zeh y'cha'peir a'leichem l'ta'heir es'chem mikole chato'seichem lifnei Hashem tit'horu" - Because on this day He will forgive you to purify you from all your sins in front of Hashem you will become purified - What do the last three words of this phrase add to our understanding? The verse tells us that on this special day of Yom Kippur Hashem readily accepts our contrition and repentance. One might then put aside any efforts at repenting before Yom Kippur. This is why the verse adds on, "lifnei Hashem tit'horu." Even before we will experience Hashem, the Holy Name of mercy, which readily forgives, nevertheless, "lifnei Hashem tit'horu," earlier, before the day of Hashem's merciful atonement we should begin our purification process.

² Again, he avoided answering the question, as he had no tradition regarding this.