



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

Yuma Daf Nun

- **Q:** How can we say that the replacement Kohen Gadol should bring the chatas of the Kohen Gadol who died? The halacha is that a chatas whose owner has died must itself be left to die!?
A: Ravin bar R' Ada said, this chatas is considered to be the chatas of the tzibbur, which is not left to die. We find that this is the shita of the **T"K** in a Mishna. In that Mishna, **R' Meir** says to the **T"K** (who said that only a korbon tzibbur overrides Shabbos and tumah, but a korbon yachid does not), "The par of Yom Kippur is a korbon yachid, and yet it overrides Shabbos and tumah". We see that the **T"K** must hold that it is considered to be a korbon tzibbur.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Braisa which is a continuation of the conversation in that Mishna, says that **R' Yaakov** said to the **T"K**, we find that the "par helam davar" of the tzibbur does not override Shabbos or tumah! Does that mean that the **T"K** holds that this korbon is a korbon yachid? That can't be! The same holds true for the conversation between **R' Meir** and the **T"K**. Rather, what they are saying is that the **T"K's** general rule as to when a korbon overrides Shabbos and tumah is incorrect. The correct general rule should be, that if a korbon has a fixed time in which it must be brought, then it overrides Shabbos and tumah, even if that korbon is a korbon yachid. If a korbon does not have to be brought at a fixed time, it does not override Shabbos and tumah, even if it is a korbon tzibbur.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that the par and goat of Yom Kippur are each considered to be a korbon tzibbur. How could **Rava** say that it is not? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the par helam davar which is clearly of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "of Yom Kippur"! **A:** That is referring to the goat, not the par.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the par of Yom Kippur is lost and replaced, if the original one is found, **R' Yehuda** says it is left to die and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say it is left to get a mum and then sold, because the chatas of the tzibbur is not left to die!? **A:** The Mishna should be read as saying that it is not left to die because it is considered to be a chatas of *partners*.
 - **Q: R' Elazar** once asked, according to the shita that the par of Yom Kippur is a korbon yachid, is it subject to temurah or not? We see that there is a shita who says that the par is considered to be a korbon tzibbur, not like **Rava**!? **A: Rava** would say, from that question we can only see that there is a shita which says that it is considered to be the korbon of partners, not necessarily the korbon of the tzibbur.
 - **Q:** Why did **R' Elazar** question whether the Yom Kippur par is subject to temurah? Was he unsure whether, for temurah purposes, we follow the person who was makdish the animal (in this case, the Kohen Gadol, who is an individual and therefore could have his animal subject to temurah), or the persons receiving a kapparah through the animal (in this case, all the Kohanim, which would make this a korbon belonging to partners, and therefore not subject to temurah)? That can't be, because we have learned that **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** clearly says that we follow those receiving the kapparah!? **A:** His question was whether the kapparah of the other Kohanim is considered to be part of the main kapparah offered by the korbon (in which case they are considered partners in it), or whether their kapparah is a "by-product" of the

kapparah for the Kohen Gadol (in which case the korbán is considered to be his alone, and therefore subject to temurah).

- We can try and answer **R' Elazar's** question from a Braisa. The Braisa says that an animal that was initially made kodesh as a korbán is more stringent than an animal made kodesh through temurah, in that it applies to korbán yachid and tzibbur, it overrides Shabbos and tumah, and can create temurah. On the other hand, a korbán that is made kodesh through temurah is more stringent than a korbán that is made kodesh initially in that it takes effect even on an animal that has a permanent mum (which will then be redeemed, but may never be sheared, or worked with). Now, which korbán that became initially kodesh is the Braisa referring to (the Gemara now assumes that the Braisa is referring to a specific example). It can't be a korbán yachid, because then it would not override Shabbos or tumah. It can't be a korbán tzibbur, because then temurah would not apply. It therefore must be referring to the par of Yom Kippur, which overrides Shabbos and tumah because it must be brought at a fixed time, and may create temurah because it is considered to be a korbán yachid. This can answer **R' Elazar's** question!
 - **R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa may be referring to the ram brought by Aharon, which is not brought on behalf of the other Kohanim, and is truly a korbán yachid. In fact, the Braisa cannot be referring to the par, because as a chatas, the temurah would be the temurah of a chatas, regarding which the halacha is that it must be left to die!
 - It may be that the Braisa is referring to the par. True, the temurah of the par would have to be left to die, but the Braisa is referring to the category of temurah, not the temurah for this particular korbán.
 - **Q:** Based on this answer, maybe when the Braisa refers to a korbán that became kodesh initially it also does not refer to a specific example, but rather the category as a whole!? **A:** It clearly does not refer to this category as a whole, because within this category there are korbános on which initial kedusha takes effect even with a permanent mum, namely a bechor and animal ma'aser. Therefore, the Braisa that says initial kedusha does take effect on animals with a permanent mum cannot be referring to the category as a whole.
 - **Q:** Why does **R' Sheishes** suggest that the Braisa refers to the ram of Aharon? Why not suggest that the Braisa refers to a Korbán Pesach, which overrides Shabbos and tumah, and can create temurah because it is truly a korbán yachid!? **A:** He holds that a Pesach may not be brought for one individual (it must be brought for a group and will therefore not be subject to temurah).
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he suggest that it refers to Pesach Sheini, which may be brought for an individual!? **A:** Pesach Sheini does not override tumah.