



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Yuma Daf Mem Aleph

- **R' Chisda** said, when one brings a pair of birds as korbanos (one as a chatas and one as an olah), the designation of each bird as a particular korban can only take effect either at the time of the purchase of the birds or at the time that the Kohen offers the korban.
 - **Q:** A Braisa (quoted last Daf) said that the pasuk teaches that the gorel must determine which animal is brought as a chatas and which goes to the Azazel. The pasuk teaches this, for we would have thought that if birds can be determined by verbal designation, but not by gorel, surely the goats, which can be determined by gorel, should be able to be determined by verbal designation as well. Now, the time of the gorel is not the time that the goats are purchased or the time that the korban is offered, and yet the Braisa says, that if not for the pasuk, we would learn that a verbal designation can take effect at that time!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa was using the kal v'chomer to teach that verbal designation should determine the goats at the time of purchase or offering, but the pasuk teaches that *only* the gorel may determine that.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a poor person was chayuv to bring, and therefore separated money to purchase, bird korbanos, and he then became rich (and must therefore bring animal korbanos instead of birds), and he then designated the funds (for a chatas and for an olah), the halacha is that the chatas money may be used towards his animal chatas, but he may not use the olah money for that. Now, he designated the money not at the time of purchase or offering, and yet the Braisa says that the designation takes effect!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, we have learned that **R' Elazar in the name of R' Hoshaya** said, a wealthy man who brings the korban of a poor man is not yotzeh. If so, his designation should not be effective either! Therefore, it must be that the Braisa means that the designation took place at the time that he separated the money, and that is why the designation takes effect.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Chaga in the name of R' Yoshiya**, who says that a wealthy man who brings the korban of a poor man *is* yotzeh, that would mean that the Braisa does not need to be referring to a designation at the time of separation of the money. If so, the Braisa is problematic according to **R' Chisda**, who said that a designation does not take effect at that time!? **A:** Amend the Braisa to say, that after becoming wealthy, "he purchases the birds and designates them at that time". The designation takes effect because it was done at the time of purchase.
 - **Q:** How can we say he purchased the birds? The Braisa says that he may use the chatas money for his animal chatas!? It can't be that he redeems the chatas bird and uses the money for his animal, because bird korbanos may not be redeemed!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa discusses where he bought only one of the two birds (giving it a particular designation at that time), thereby automatically designating the remaining money with the designation of the remaining korban. If that remaining money has chatas designation, the money may be used for the animal chatas.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a poor man brings the korban of a wealthy man he is yotzeh, but if a wealthy person brings the korban of a poor man for the korban of a metzarah, he is not yotzeh. This is problematic according to **R' Chaga** who, although was talking about the korban for

one who walks into the Mikdash when tamei, said that he would be yotzeh!? **A:** By metzora the pasuk says “zos”, which teaches that one is only yotzeh for bringing the korban he is supposed to bring.

- **Q:** If so, why is the poor man in the first part of the Mishna yotzeh? **A:** The pasuk says “toras” which is an inclusive word, and teaches that the poor man will be yotzeh.
- **Q:** Why don't we learn the case of tamei Mikdash from the case of metzora? **A:** The pasuk says “v'ihm dal hu”, which limits the metzora restrictions to the case of metzora.

MISHNA

- He ties a string of red wool to the head of the goat to be sent to the Azazel, and has it stand at the place where it will be sent off from, and the Chatas goat at its place of shechita.
- He then goes back to his ox for a second time, does semicha and says viduy for himself and the Kohanim. When the people there hear him say the Name of Hashem, they respond “Baruch Sheim...”

GEMARA

- **Q:** When the Mishna says “the Chatas goat at its place of shechita”, does that mean that the Chatas goat is stood at its place of shechita (near the Mizbe'ach), or that a red string is placed at its place of shechita (on its neck)? **A:** **R' Yosef** taught a Braisa that said, “He ties a string of red wool to the head of the goat to be sent to the Azazel and has it stand at the place from where it will be sent off, and the Chatas goat at its place of shechita, so that the animals don't get mixed up with each other or with other animals”. Now, if the Braisa means that a red string is tied around the Chatas goat's neck, that would be how it prevents it from getting mixed up with other animals. If, however, it only refers to the placing of the animal at a particular place in the Azarah, that would not prevent that mix up. Therefore, it must be referring to a red string tied around its neck.
- **R' Yitzchak** said, I have heard differences between the red string used for the parah adumah and the one used for the Azazel goat, that one needs a minimum weight and one can be of any weight, but I do not know which one has the requirement.
 - **R' Yosef** said, we can determine that it is the goat that needs the larger string, because it must be split into two, and therefore presumably must be larger.
 - **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, maybe it is the parah adumah string that needs to be heavier, because it must be thrown into the fire!? **A: Rava** said, whether the parah adumah string needs to have weight is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im.
 - **Q:** We find that the parah adumah string also must be split into two, because part of it is used to tie the wood and grass together!? **A:** It is tied with the end of that one string.
 - **R' Chanin in the name of Rav** said, if the wood or red string used for the parah adumah are burned mid-air, before falling into the fire, it is still valid.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the string gets burned mid-air, another string must be brought!? **A: Abaye** explained, **R' Chanin** was talking about a low fire, and the Braisa is talking about a high fire (so it never reached the main body of the fire). **A2: Rava** said, whether the parah adumah string needs to have weight is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im.
- **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, I have heard there are differences between 3 strings that are used: the one for the parah adumah, the one for the Azazel goat, and the one for the metzora. One must weigh 10 zuz, one must weigh 2 sela'im, and one must weigh a shekel, but I do not know which one must weigh which amount.
 - **Ravin** explained in the name of **R' Yonason**, the string of the parah adumah must weigh 10 zuz, of the goat must weigh 2 sela'im, and of the metzora must weigh a shekel.

- **R' Yochanan** said that **R' Shimon ben Chalafta** and the **Rabanan** argue regarding the string of the parah adumah: one says it must weigh 10 zuz, and the other says it must weigh a shekel.
 - **R' Yirmiya M'Difti** said to **Ravina**, they argued about the string of the goat, not of the parah.