



20 Sivan 5781
May 31, 2021

Yoma Daf 50

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"ḥ

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. One considers blood to be designated ‘bull’, the other holds that blood is not designated ‘bull’.

Rav Ashi supports the position that blood is designated as ‘bull’, from the verse which states that Aaron will enter the Holy of Holies (on Yom Kippur) with a bull. Now, does he bring it in by the horns? [Of course not!] Rather, it 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 “bull.”

And the other one? - He explains the verse to mean that in order for Aaron to enter the Holy, he must bring a young bull as a chatas 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 Mishnah in which Rabbi Meir said to [the Tanna Kamma] that the Kohen Gadol's bull on Yom Kippur, his chavittin minchah offering each day, and a Pesach sacrifice, are individual's sacrifices, and yet override Shabbos, implying that the other opinion in the Mishnah says that these are communal sacrifices.

Rava deflected this proof, since the Mishnah continues with Rabbi Yaakov's statement to [the Tanna Kamma] 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 Mishnah.] Rather,

we must say that both Rabbi Yaakov and Rabbi Meir are simply challenging the rule of the Tanna Kamma, for they heard him say that a communal sacrifice overrides Shabbos and tumah, while an individual one does not override Shabbos and tumah. Whereupon Rabbi Meir said: Is [the law concerning] the offering of an individual a general rule, is there not the bull of Yom Kippur? Are there not the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol and the pesach sacrifice, all of which are private offerings, and yet they override both the Shabbos and the tumah? And also Rabbi Yaakov said: Is the law concerning the offering of the community a rule, are there not the bull for an error of the community, and the he-goats for idolatry, and the chagigah offering, all of which are community-offerings yet do not override the laws of the Shabbos, nor those of tumah? Rather accept this principle: Whatever has a fixed time, overrides both the laws of the Shabbos and those of tumah, even [though the sacrifice concerned be that] of an individual; and whatever has no definite time fixed does not override the Shabbos laws nor those affecting tumah even if a community-offering [were involved]. (50a1 – 50a3)

Abaye cites a Baraisa to challenge Rava's position that no one considers the Kohen Gadol's bull a communal sacrifice. If a bull or goat of Yom Kippur were lost and replaced, and then found, they must be put to death. And similarly, if he-goats of mistaken communal idolatry were lost and replaced, and then found, they must be put to death; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say that they left to graze until they develop a blemish, and then they are sold,¹ with the proceeds going for voluntary communal sacrifices, since a communal chatas is not put to death.

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

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

Abaye asks from another Baraisa: If a bull of Yom Kippur or goat of Yom Kippur were lost and replaced, and then found, they must be put to death; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon say that they left to graze until they develop a blemish, and then they are sold, with the proceeds going for voluntary communal sacrifices, since a communal chatas is not put to death. 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. (50a3 – 50a4)

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 implies only that others say that it is a shared sacrifice, but not a communal one. (50a4 – 50b1)

¹ This is an act of redemption, as the sanctity of the animal is transferred to the money; the animal has been deconsecrated.

Temurah on the bull

The Gemora returns to discuss Rabbi Elozar's inquiry: Rabbi Elozar inquired whether the one who considers the bull of Yom Kippur an individual sacrifice, can cause another animal to be consecrated through *temurah – exchange*, or not? What was the basis of his inquiry? 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 it is obvious that *temurah* is performed by the one being atoned for, for Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: He who consecrates must add the fifth to it² and he who obtains atonement thereby can effect *temurah* with it, and one who separates the terumah from his own produce for that of his fellow has the benefit of the pleasure! Rather, it is obvious that it is determined by the one being atoned for, but his question was whether the Kohanim receive atonement as established partners to the sacrifice,³ or only as an extension of the Kohen Gadol's atonement.⁴

The Gemora tries to resolve this from a Baraisa. The Baraisa says that a sacrifice is stricter than *temurah*, and a *temurah* has a stringency over an ordinary offering as well. A sacrifice is stricter, since a sacrifice may be owned by an individual and a community, it overrides Shabbos and impurity, and it can sanctify another animal through *temurah*, which is not the case by *temurah*. *Temurah* is stricter than a sacrifice, as *temurah* can take effect on an animal with a permanent blemish, and the animal cannot be deconsecrated in a manner where it is permitted to shear its wool or work it, which is not the case by an ordinary sacrifice. The Gemora analyzes the sacrifice this Baraisa 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.⁵ Rav Sheishes deflects this by saying that it refers to the ram brought by the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur.⁶

Rav Sheishes says that this is a better explanation, for if we were to assume the reference is to the bull, [the question would arise: is it] that the *temurah* of the bull does not override the Shabbos or the laws of tumah, but on a weekday it can be offered; surely is it not the *temurah* of a chatas, and 'the *temurah* of a chatas is left to die'? The Gemora deflects this by saying that the Baraisa may be referring to the Kohen Gadol's bull, but when it is mentioned *temurah*, it 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 Baraisa also refers to sacrifices in general, proving nothing about the bull. The Gemora rejects this possibility since the Baraisa 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 shear its wool. If the Baraisa 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 shear their wool. Rather, the Baraisa 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

² When he redeems it.

³ And then it cannot be used to effect *temurah*.

⁴ Making it akin to a sacrifice atoning for an individual, which can make *temurah*.

⁵ Evidently, it is regarded as a private offering, and it may be used to effect *temurah*.

⁶ Which was an individual sacrifice with a set time.

Partners without a Shavah Perutah

The Minchas Chinuch (325) quotes Rashi that whenever a mitzva mandates ל'בם - it has to be yours, if one owns less than a שוה פרוטה it is also lacking בם. He asks that according to that, how will people fulfill the mitzva of Sukkos when each stem is valued as less than a שוה 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 שוה פרוטה. Rashi holds that to be considered a *partner* with others, you must possess at least a שוה 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 שוה פרוטה? In Sefer Tal, 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 korban שותפין, even though a יורש only receives atonement in the form of מילוקפיא - hovering over them? Tosfos answers that when everyone has an equal share in the בפרה, 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 בקיוטה 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 חטאות that have a פסיקתא מיתה on them. The Ritva brings from a that an acronym to remember them by is ותמנע. ותמנע is

חתאת	ולד	-	I
תמורה	-	-	T
בעליה	מתה	-	M
הבעלים	נתכפחו	-	N
שנתה	ערבה	-	U

בדרך תמנע was the concubine of עשו. Perhaps we can say סנהדרין based on a Gemora in DDorsch. She was a daughter of a king and wanted to convert and the אבות 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 מילוקפיא is that it is floating or hovering over the korban and not an actual בפרה. Rabbeinu Chananel learns it in a different way. He states that מילוקפיא is derived from the word הקפה - circle or surround. Therefore he learns that the kohanim are only considered partners from the time of וידוי - confession, when they all gather around to hear it. It comes out that after the וידוי, the kohen gadol would certainly not be allowed to make a תמורה from it, because by then everyone would be considered the בעלים.