



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

Yuma Daf Samach Daled

IHM SHEL SHEM MEIS ZEH SHE'ALAH ALAV...

- **Rav** says, the goat remaining alive from the first pair is the one used for the Chatas or the Azazel, and the duplicate of the new pair is the one left to graze. **R' Yochanan** says, the one remaining from the first pair is left to graze and the second pair is used in its entirety.
 - The machlokes is, **Rav** holds that live things do not become permanently rejected (even though it could not be brought once its pair died, when a new animal is brought, the first animal again becomes valid). **R' Yochanan** holds that even living things that become passul, can never become valid again.
 - **Rav** learns his view from an animal less than 8 days old, which may not be brought as a korbon, but may be brought after it reaches 8 days old.
 - **Q:** That case is different because it never had a period of validity before its invalidity!? **A:** **Rav** learns his view from an animal that had a temporary mum (it was valid before it got it, passul while it had it, and valid again after it is gone). We know that such an animal becomes valid again, because the pasuk says "mum **bam**", which teaches that only while there is a mum is it passul.
 - **R' Yochanan** says that the pasuk also says "bahem", which teaches that this concept of revalidation only applies to the invalidity of a mum, not to other types of invalidation. **Rav** says that the "bahem" teaches that they are only passul in isolation. However, if limbs of an animal with a mum became mixed with limbs of valid animals (and they can't be told apart), as long as one of the limbs were already offered onto the Mizbe'ach, the remaining limbs may be offered as well.
 - **R' Yochanan** learns this halacha from the fact that the pasuk says "bahem" instead of "bam". **Rav** doesn't learn a drasha from this.
 - **Q:** According to **Rav**, we can understand that the animal remaining of the first pair does not become passul, but why must that one be brought? **A:** **Rava** said, **Rav** holds like **R' Yose** who says that ideally, the first one should always be used for korbanos (this was explained earlier, that we see this from Pesach, where the first animal is used, even if it is lost and found after a second animal was already separated).
 - **Rava** said, our Mishna seems to follow **Rav**, because it says, "If the goat for Hashem died, the new goat should take its place". This suggests that the original Azazel goat is still used. A Braisa seems to follow **R' Yochanan**, because it says that the pasuk "yamad chai" teaches that the animal to be used is the one of the new pair.
 - **Q:** The Mishna brings the shita of **R' Yehuda**, who says that if the blood of the Chatas spills, we must let the Azazel goat die (and bring a new pair to be used in its entirety). We see that only the new pair is used!? **A:** **Rav** would agree that **R' Yehuda** does not hold like him, but has the **T"K** who does hold like him.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** (that only the new pair is used), what is the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** (who seem to argue whether the remaining goat of the first pair or the entire second pair is used)? **A:** We have already stated that the Mishna seems to follow **Rav**.

- **Q:** The Mishna says that the animal from the second pair that is not used is left to graze, because it is a korbon tzibbur. However, had it been a korbon yachid, it would have been left to die. Now, this makes sense according to **R' Yochanan**, because a korbon yachid is left to die only when the original animal is lost and the replacement is used. In that case, the original animal is left to die. However, according to **Rav** (that the original animal is used), this second animal is more akin to the case of where a second animal is separated as "achrayus" to make sure that an animal is available in case something happens to the first animal. In that case, the second animal of this korbon yachid (if not used) is left to graze, and not left to die!? **A:** Since **Rava** has explained that **Rav** holds like **R' Yose** that the first animal must be used, the second animal has the status as if it was separated "to be lost", in which case it must be left to die.
- **Q:** In the Mishna, **R' Yehuda** argues and says that the animal must be left to die. According to **R' Yochanan** this makes sense, because **R' Yehuda** is arguing on the **T"K** who says that the animal of the first pair must be left to graze, and **R' Yehuda** is saying that it must be left to die. However, according to **Rav**, since the **T"K** is referring to the animal of the second pair, **R' Yehuda** must be saying that the animal of the second pair is left to die. We see that **R' Yehuda** holds a live animal can become permanently rejected, which means that he can't use the first animal. If so, how can the second animal be left to die? What animal will be used for the Avodah!? **A:** Even according to **Rav**, **R' Yehuda** is referring to the remaining animal of the first pair, and is saying that it must be left to die.
 - **Q: Others** ask that according to **R' Yochanan**, why does the Mishna say "and **R' Yehuda** says *further*"? According to **R' Yochanan**, both the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** agree that live animals can be permanently rejected. There is only one machlokes, whether the animal of the first pair is left to graze or to die!? **A: KASHYEH.**