

NOTES

I stated my opinion in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis – כי אמינא אליבא דרבנן – Rashi explains, particularly based on the expression: And furthermore, that Rabbi Yehuda disagrees with the Rabbis with regard to two points: With regard to the goat chosen for the offering, as well as what is done with the goat that is not sacrificed. Some commentators suggest that Rabbi Yehuda himself was unclear whether the Rabbis disagree with regard to both points (Ritva).

תנן: ועוד אמר רבי יהודה: נשפך הדם – ימות המשתלח, מת המשתלח – ישפך הדם. בשלמא לרבי יוחנן דאמר בעלי חיים נדחין – משום הכי ימות המשתלח, אלא לרב דאמר בעלי חיים אינן נדחין – אמאי ימות המשתלח?

We learned in the mishna: **And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat is left to die.** Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled, and two other goats are brought and lots are drawn. **Granted, according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said that animals that become disqualified are permanently rejected, even after the source of their initial disqualification is no longer present, due to that reason the scapegoat is left to die. However, according to Rav, who said that animals are not permanently rejected, why is the scapegoat left to die?**

אמר לך רב: אליבא דרבי יהודה לא קא אמינא, כי אמינא – אליבא דרבנן.

Rav could have said to you: **I did not state my opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. I stated my opinion in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis.**ⁿ Rabbi Yehuda holds that disqualified animals are permanently rejected and communal sin-offerings may be left to die. The Rabbis disagree with both issues and hold that disqualified animals are not permanently disqualified, and communal sin-offerings that are disqualified are not left to die, but rather graze until they develop a blemish, and then are sold. Rav, who holds that the remaining goat from the first pair is sacrificed, states his opinion in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, i.e., that disqualified animals are not permanently rejected.

בשלמא לרב – בהא פליגי רבי יהודה ורבנן, אלא לרבי יוחנן במאי פליגי? אמר רבא: הא אמרינן דיקא מתנתין בותיה דרב.

The Gemara comments: **Granted, according to the opinion of Rav, Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis disagree with regard to whether disqualified animals are permanently rejected. However, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that even according to the Rabbis the remaining goat of the first pair is left to graze, with regard to what principle do Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis disagree? Rava said: Didn't we say that the language of the mishna is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rav, and it is difficult to explain the mishna's language in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan?**

תנן: שאין חטאת עבור מתה. הא דחיד כי האי גוונא – מתה. בשלמא לרבי יוחנן – כדרבי אבא אמר רב, דאמר רבי אבא אמר רב:

We learned in the mishna that a communal sin-offering is not left to die. This indicates that the sin-offering of an individual in a case like this is left to die. **Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that the remaining goat from the first pair is left to graze until it develops a blemish, it can be explained that the sin-offering of an individual in a comparable case is killed, in accordance with the opinion that Rabbi Abba said that Rav said. As Rabbi Abba said that Rav said:**

Perek VI
Daf 65 Amud a

NOTES

One who designates two sin-offerings as a guarantee – מפריש שתי חטאות לאחריית: The early commentaries ask how this is possible: One cannot designate two sin-offerings for the same transgression, and there is a principle that whenever two things cannot be done one after the other, they also cannot be done simultaneously. The solution here is to say that if two are designated as a guarantee, it is not considered as dedicating two sin-offerings together (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

HALAKHA

One who designates two sin-offerings as a guarantee – מפריש שתי חטאות לאחריית: One who designates two sin-offerings as a guarantee gains atonement through whichever animal he wishes, and the second grazes until it becomes unfit. It is then sold and the money is used to purchase a gift-offering (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:5).

הכל מודים שאם נתפס בשאינה אבודה – אבודה מתה.

Everyone concedes that if the animal one designated as a sin-offering became lost, and he designated another animal in its stead and then found the first animal, **if he gained atonement through the one that was not lost, i.e., the second one, the one that was lost is left to die.**

אלא לרב, הוה ליה כמפריש שתי חטאות לאחריית. ואמר רבי אושעיא: הפריש שתי חטאות לאחריית – מתכפר באחת מהם, והשני תרעה!

However, according to the opinion of Rav, who rules that the remaining goat from the first pair is the one that is sacrificed, that goat was never disqualified, and the extra goat from the second pair was designated to serve the same purpose as the remaining goat. **This is like one who designates two sin-offerings as a guarantee,^{NH} so that if he loses one of them he will still be able to bring the other one. And Rabbi Oshaya said that all agree that if one separated two sin-offerings as a guarantee, he gains atonement through one of them, and the second is left to graze until it becomes unfit. Consequently, even the sin-offering of an individual is not left to die in this case.**

בין דאמר רבא: רב סבר לה פרבי
יוסי, דאמר מצוה בראשון, מעיקרא
כמפריש לאיבוד דמי.

The Gemara answers: Since Rava said that Rav holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that the mitzva should be performed with the first animal, when one designates the second animal, it is considered from the beginning to be comparable to an offering separated in order to be lost. In that case, if it is the sin-offering of an individual, the second animal is left to die.

תנן, רבי יהודה אומר: תמות. בשלמא
לרבי יוחנן, דאמר שני שבוג ראשון
ירעה, לרבי יהודה ימות – מתבפר בשני
שבוג שני.

We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: It should be left to die. Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan, who said that the second goat of the first pair should be left to graze, according to Rabbi Yehuda, who said it should be left to die, he nonetheless gains atonement with the second goat of the second pair.

אלא לרב דאמר שני שבוג שני ירעה
לרבי יהודה ימות, לרבי יהודה במאי
מיכפר? מי סברת רבי יהודה אשני
שבוג שני קאי? רבי יהודה אשני שבוג
ראשון קאי.

However, according to Rav, who said that the second goat of the second pair should be left to graze, and according to Rabbi Yehuda it should be left to die, then according to Rabbi Yehuda he cannot sacrifice either of the two goats: The first goat may not be sacrificed because Rabbi Yehuda holds that disqualified animals are permanently rejected, and the second goat must be left to die. With which goat will he gain atonement? The Gemara answers: Do you maintain that Rabbi Yehuda was referring to the second goat of the second pair when he said it should be left to die? Rabbi Yehuda was referring to the second goat of the first pair. The second goat of the second pair is sacrificed.

ואיכא דקא מותיב הכי: ועוד אמר רבי
יהודה: נשפך הדם – ימות המשתלח,
מת המשתלח – ישפך הדם.

There are those who raised this objection from the statement of Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna. And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat is left to die. Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled, and two other goats are brought and lots are drawn.

בשלמא לרב – רישא פליגי בחטאת
צבור, וסיפא פליגי בבעלי חיים. אלא
לרבי יוחנן מאי 'ועוד' קשיא.

Granted, according to Rav, in the first clause of the mishna they disagree with regard to a communal sin-offering. According to the Rabbis the second animal is left to graze, whereas according to Rabbi Yehuda it is left to die. And in the latter clause they disagree with regard to whether animals that become disqualified as offerings are permanently rejected. According to the Rabbis they are not rejected and therefore the first goat is sacrificed, whereas Rabbi Yehuda holds that they are rejected and therefore the first goat is left to die and the second goat is sacrificed. However, according to Rabbi Yohanan, what does the term: And furthermore, in the mishna indicate? Even the Rabbis agree that the remaining goat from the first pair is permanently disqualified. The Gemara comments that indeed, this is difficult.^N

'ועוד אמר רבי יהודה: נשפך הדם
ימות המשתלח'. בשלמא נשפך הדם
ימות המשתלח – דאבתי לא איתעביד
מצותיה.

It was taught in the mishna: And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: If the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled before it was sprinkled, the scapegoat should be left to die. Similarly, if the scapegoat dies, the blood of the goat sacrificed to God should be spilled. The Gemara asks: Granted, if the blood of the goat sacrificed to God spilled, the scapegoat should be left to die, as the mitzva of the blood has not yet been performed, as it was not sprinkled in the prescribed manner.

אלא מת המשתלח אמאי ישפך הדם?
הא איתעביד ליה מצותיה!

However, if the scapegoat dies, why should the blood of the goat sacrificed to God be spilled? The mitzva of the scapegoat has already been performed. The only essential detail with regard to the scapegoat is the lottery, which has already been performed by the priest. Sending it to Azazel and pushing it off a cliff are carried out by an appointed person and while they are prescribed *ab initio*, they are not indispensable. After the fact, if the goat dies in some other way, the obligation has been fulfilled.

NOTES

This is difficult – קשיא: Commentaries have noted that this is only a difficulty according to the way that the mishna was interpreted in accordance with the opinion of Rav. It is also possible to explain the mishna differently, although it would still not indicate that Rabbi Yohanan's opinion is correct (see *Kashot Meyushav*).

If the funds were already collected – אם נתרמה תרומה – When funds were taken from the chamber, they were considered to have been taken from among all the coins that were donated for this purpose, including those that had not yet arrived at the Temple. The principle at work here is that the Temple acquires not only what is on hand but also the money that has not yet been received, because wherever it may be, it is in God's possession.

The messengers take an oath to the treasurers of the Temple – נשבעין לגבירין: Although oaths are not generally taken with regard to consecrated property, it was decreed that in this instance the messenger does take an oath. This was in order to ensure that people would not treat consecrated property lightly by not guarding it properly.

אמרי דבי רבי ינאי אמר קרא: "ועמד חי לפני ה' לכפר" עד מתי יהא זקוק להיות חי – עד שעת מתן דמים של חבריו.

תנן התם: בני העיר ששלחו את שקליהן ונגנבו או שאבדו, אם נתרמה תרומה – נשבעין לגבירין,

ואם לאו – נשבעין לבני העיר, ובני העיר שוקלין אחרים תחתיהן.

נמצאו, או שהחזירו הגנבים – אלו ואלו שקלים הם, ואין עולין להן לשנה הבאה. רבי יהודה אומר: עולין להן לשנה הבאה.

מאי טעמא דרבי יהודה? אמר רבא: קסבר רבי יהודה חובות של שנה זו קריבות לשנה הבאה.

אייתיביה אביי: פר ושעיר של יום הכפורים שאבדו, והפריש אחרים תחתיהן, וכן שעירי עבודה זרה שאבדו והפריש אחרים תחתיהן – כולן ימותו, דברי רבי יהודה. רבי אליעזר ורבי שמעון אומרים: ירעו עד שייסתאבו, וימכרו, ויפלו דמיהם לנדבה, שאין חטאת צבור מתה. אמר ליה:

The Sages of the house of Rabbi Yannai said that the verse states: "But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be stood alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him, to send him away to Azazel into the wilderness" (Leviticus 16:10). Until when must the scapegoat be alive? Until the blood of its counterpart is sprinkled, and if it dies before, the blood is disqualified.

We learned in a mishna there (*Shekalim* 2:1): If residents of a city sent their shekels to the Temple with a messenger, and the shekels were stolen or were lost along the way,¹¹ if the funds were already collected,¹² i.e., the coins for the new year's offerings were taken from the chamber before the money was stolen, the messengers take an oath to the treasurers of the Temple^N that they did not unlawfully use the shekels, but that they were taken unbeknownst to them or by force. This is because once the necessary coins have been removed, all other coins that have been dedicated for this purpose are considered Temple property wherever they are, and their subsequent theft does not change that status. If the messengers take this oath, they are exempt from monetary liability.

And if the funds were not yet collected when these coins were stolen, the coins are still considered the property of those who dedicated them to the Temple, and therefore the messengers take an oath to the residents of the city, and the residents of the city donate other shekels to the Temple in their stead.

If the shekels that were lost are found or the thieves returned them, both these and those are shekels, i.e., they remain sanctified, but they do not count toward the amount due the following year. The next year the members of that city must donate new shekels; they have not fulfilled the second year's obligation by having given twice the previous year. Rabbi Yehuda says: They do count toward the following year.

The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda? Rava said: Rabbi Yehuda holds that the obligations of this year are also brought the following year, and therefore it is possible to fulfill one's obligation for the next year by using the shekels of this year.

Abaye raised an objection to this explanation. It was taught that if the bull and goat of Yom Kippur were lost and one designated others in their stead, and similarly if the goats which atone for a communal transgression of idol worship by instruction of the court were lost and he designated others in their stead, and the original animals were found, all the original animals should be left to die, and cannot be sacrificed at a later time. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon say: They should be left to graze until they become unfit. Then they are sold, and the money received in their sale will go to the purchase of a public gift-offering, as a communal sin-offering is not left to die. According to Rabbi Yehuda, if the obligations of this year may be brought the following year, the bull and goat of Yom Kippur that were lost should be sacrificed the following year, and not left to die. Rava said to him:

HALAKHA

If residents of a city sent their shekels to the Temple and they were lost – בני העיר ששלחו שקליהם ואבדו – If residents of a city sent their shekels to Jerusalem and the money was stolen or lost along the way, the *halakha* is as follows: If the messenger was not paid, he swears that he was not negligent with the money and is free from liability, in accordance with the *halakhot* of an unpaid guardian. The residents of the city must then donate their shekels a second time. If the first shekels are then found, both collections are considered consecrated. The second collection cannot count toward the following year. Instead, the first set of shekels goes toward the

collection of the current year and the second set is included with the leftover shekels of the previous year.

If the messenger was paid, he is liable to pay if the coins were stolen or lost. However, if they were stolen by armed robbers, the messenger must swear to this effect, and he is exempt. In this case, if the shekels were stolen after the funds were already collected from the chamber, the residents of the city are exempt. However, if the money was stolen before the contributions were removed from the chamber, they must donate shekels again (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 3:8–9).

קִרְבָּנוֹת צְבוּר קָא אֲמַרְתָּ? שְׂאֵי
קִרְבָּנוֹת צְבוּר כְּדַרְבֵי טְבִי אֲמַר רַבִּי
יֵאֱשִׁיָּהּ. דְּאֲמַר רַבִּי טְבִי אֲמַר רַבִּי
יֵאֱשִׁיָּהּ, אֲמַר קָרָא: "זֹאת עֹלֹת הַדָּשׁ
בְּחֻדְשׁוֹ", אֲמַרָה תּוֹרָה: חֹדֶשׁ וְהֵבֵא לִי
קִרְבֶּן מִתְרוּמָה חֻדְשָׁה.

תֵּינַח שְׁעִיר, פֶּר מֵאֵי אֵיכָא לְמִימְרֵי?
גְזִירָה פֶּר אֵטוּ שְׁעִיר.

וּמִשּׁוֹם גְזִירָה יְמוּתוֹ? וְעוֹד, הָא דְרַבִּי
טְבִי אֲמַר רַבִּי יֵאֱשִׁיָּהּ גּוֹפֵה מִצֵּוָה
הִיא. דְּאֲמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אֲמַר שְׂמוּאֵל:
קִרְבָּנוֹת צְבוּר הֵבֵאִין בְּאֶחָד בְּנִיטָן –
מִצֵּוָה לְהֵבִיא מִן הַחֹדֶשׁ, וְאִם הֵבִיא
מִן הַיָּשׁוֹן – יֵצֵא, אֲלָא שְׂחַסְרֵי מִצֵּוָה!

אֲלָא אֲמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא: לְפִי שְׂאִין הַגּוֹרֵל
קוֹבֵעַ מִשָּׁנָה לְחֻבְרָתָהּ. וְנִימְרֵי וְנִגְרִיל!
גְזִירָה שְׂמָא יֵאֱמָרוּ הַגּוֹרֵל קוֹבֵעַ מִשָּׁנָה
לְחֻבְרָתָהּ.

הָא תֵינַח שְׁעִיר, פֶּר מֵאֵי אֵיכָא לְמִימְרֵי?
גְזִירָה פֶּר אֵטוּ שְׁעִיר. וּמִשּׁוֹם גְזִירָה
יְמוּתוֹ?

אֲמָרוּהּ רַבָּנֵי קַמְיָה דְאֲבֵי: גְזִירָה מִשּׁוֹם
חֲטָאֵת שְׂמָתוֹ בְּעֵלְיָהּ. הָא תֵינַח פֶּר,
שְׁעִיר מֵאֵי אֵיכָא לְמִימְרֵי? גְזִירָה שְׁעִיר
אֵטוּ פֶּר.

וּמִשּׁוֹם גְזִירָה יְמוּתוֹ? אֲלָא: גְזִירָה
מִשּׁוֹם חֲטָאֵת שְׂעֵבְרָה שְׂנֵתָהּ. גְזִירָה!
הִיא גּוֹפֵה חֲטָאֵת שְׂעֵבְרָה שְׂנֵתָהּ
הִיא!

You speak of communal offerings? Communal offerings are different, in accordance with what Rabbi Tavi said in the name of Rabbi Yoshiya. As Rabbi Tavi said that Rabbi Yoshiya said that the verse states: “This is the burnt-offering for every New Moon upon its renewal” throughout the months of the year” (Numbers 28:14). The Torah said: Renew and bring Me an offering from the new contribution.ⁿ This indicates that communal offerings must be brought from the donations of the current year and not from the donations of the previous year.^h

The Gemara challenges this solution: This works out well with regard to the Yom Kippur goat, which is a communal offering and is purchased with money from the Temple treasury. However, with regard to the High Priest’s bull which he pays for himself and which is considered an individual offering, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the bull due to the goat.

The Gemara expresses surprise: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to dieⁿ instead of being left to graze? And furthermore, this statement that Rabbi Tavi said in the name of Rabbi Yoshiya is itself a mitzva ab initio, but is not indispensable. As Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: With regard to communal offerings that are brought on the first of Nisan, it is a mitzva to bring them from the new year’s shekel contributions. However, if he brought them from the old shekels that were donated during the previous year he has fulfilled his obligation, but he lacked the mitzva, i.e., he did not perform the procedure in the proper manner. It is difficult to argue that due to this inessential detail the Sages would issue a decree that the High Priest’s bull should be left to die.

Rather, Rabbi Zeira said that the reason the bull and goat of Yom Kippur are left to die is because the lottery does not establish designations from one year to another. Therefore, a goat designated by the lottery one year is not eligible for use the next year. The Gemara challenges this explanation: But let us bring this goat and another one and draw lots again. The Gemara responds: It is a rabbinic decree that was enacted lest people say that the lottery establishes designations from one year to another.

The Gemara challenges: This works out well with regard to the goat, but with respect to the bull of the High Priest, which is not chosen by lottery, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the bull due to the goat. The Gemara challenges further: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die instead of being left to graze? Therefore, this answer should be rejected.

The Rabbis stated another solution before Abaye: It is a rabbinic decree, due to a concern that the bull will become a sin-offering whose owners have died, since the High Priest might die during the year. The Gemara responds: This works out well with regard to the bull, but as for the goat, which is a communal offering, what is there to say? The Gemara answers: There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the goat due to the bull.

The Gemara asks: Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die instead of being left to graze? Rather, it is a rabbinic decree due to a concern that the goat will become a sin-offering whose year has passed. A goat may not be brought as a sin-offering once it is more than a year old, and there is a concern that the goat will be too old by the Yom Kippur of the following year. The Gemara expresses surprise: Is this a rabbinic decree? It is certainly a sin-offering whose year has passed, as the goat will certainly be more than a year old by the following Yom Kippur.

NOTES

This is the burnt-offering for every New Moon upon its renewal – זאת עולת חודש בחודשו – This verse indicates that the burnt-offering of a particular New Moon must be purchased with the shekels donated in the current year. The Gemara elsewhere derives that this is referring to the month of Nisan. Therefore, from the month of Nisan on, communal offerings may not be purchased with the donations of the previous year.

From the new contribution – מתרומה חדשה: Commentaries have questioned this explanation: For this very reason, the shekels should also not be fit for use the following year. The answer is that the extra shekels that had been collected were not deposited in the chamber until the following year. Therefore, they were a part of the contribution of the following year, and offerings of that new year could be purchased with them (Tosafot Yeshanim).

Is it right that due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die – ומשום גזירה ימותו – There are two fundamental issues behind this question. First, causing the animals to die involves the destruction of consecrated property. In addition, there is a prohibition against causing animals undue suffering, which Rava himself holds to be a Torah prohibition (Pithei She’arim).

Each of the Sages in this passage was of the opinion that he understood the decree to be more severe than the others understood it to be, and therefore his explanation was sufficient to explain why the offering should be killed (Tosafot Yeshanim).

HALAKHA

Communal offerings from the new contributions – קרבנות העבור מתרומה חדשה: Once the New Moon of the month of Nisan arrives, communal offerings are bought from the new contributions. If new funds have not yet arrived, the shekels from old donations are used (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim 4:10).

NOTES

Redeeming houses in a walled city – גְּאוֹלַת בְּתֵי עִיר הוֹמָה – With regard to the *halakhot* of property and inheritance, the Torah (Leviticus, chapter 25) states that it is impossible to permanently sell an ancestral field. Even if the original owner does not redeem the land after selling it, the field returns to his possession during the Jubilee Year. However, there is a different *halakha* with regard to houses of walled cities. One who sells a house within a walled city has a year to redeem his house. Otherwise, it becomes the permanent property of the buyer. Houses within the walled cities of Levites, on the other hand, share the *halakhot* of ancestral fields.

A full year – שָׁנָה תְּמִימָה: Commentaries have questioned why this discussion is relevant to other cases. Since the Torah specifically mentions the expression “a full year” with regard to the redemption of houses in walled cities, perhaps it is only there that one requires a full year. In cases where the Torah simply mentions a year, perhaps one requires merely a period of twelve months. The Ritva answers that in the context of houses of walled cities, the previous verse mentions the term “a year.” Therefore, if the year with regard to redeeming houses of walled cities is a full year, the same is true of other cases where the Torah mentions a year.

HALAKHA

A full year – שָׁנָה תְּמִימָה: One who sells a house in a walled city may redeem it anytime within twelve months from the day he sold it. These twelve months are calculated from day to day (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 12:1).

Perek VI

Daf 66 Amud a

NOTES

As though it stands in a cemetery – כְּאִילוֹ הִיא עוֹמֶדֶת בְּבֵית – הקברות: The Gemara uses this expression rather than simply stating that it is left to graze in order to explain Reish Lakish's reasoning. The rejection of the animal due to its age is unlike other disqualifications. Generally, an animal is disqualified due to an action performed by a person, whereas here the disqualification is due to the animal itself. The terminology is intended to reflect that distinction (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

הָא לָא קְשִׁיָּא – כְּרַבִּי דְתַנְיָא: “שָׁנָה תְּמִימָה” – מוֹנֵה שְׁלֹשׁ מְאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים וְחֲמִשָּׁה יוֹם, כְּמִנּוּן יְמוֹת הַחֲמֵה, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי. וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים: מוֹנֵה שָׁנִים עָשָׂר חֹדֶשׁ מִיּוֹם לְיוֹם.

The Gemara responds: **This is not difficult**, as it is possible that the goat will not be disqualified, **in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As it was taught in a baraita:** With regard to redeeming houses in a walled city^N the Torah states: “And if it not be redeemed within the space of a full year” (Leviticus 25:30),^{NH} which indicates that **he counts 365 days, in accordance with the number of days in a solar year; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say: He counts twelve months from day to day.** Therefore, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, if the goat was less than eleven days old on the first Yom Kippur, it will not be disqualified on the following Yom Kippur because it will still be less than 365 days old, as long as the first year was not a leap year. Nevertheless, it is disqualified by rabbinic decree due to a concern that other goats would be used in similar circumstances even if they were more than a year old.

וְאִם נִתְעַבְּרָה – נִתְעַבְּרָה לְמוֹכֵר. הַתִּינַח שְׁעִיר, פֶּר מֵאֵי אֵיכָּא לְמִימְרָ? גִּזְרָה פֶּר אֲשֶׁר שְׁעִיר.

And if the year was extended and made into a leap year, it is extended for the benefit of the seller,^H and according to the Sages he has an additional month in which to redeem his house. The Gemara asks: This works out well with regard to the goat, but with regard to the bull, what is there to say? The bull remains valid even if it is more than a year old. The Gemara answers: **There is a rabbinic decree with regard to the bull due to the goat.**

וּמִשּׁוֹם גִּזְרָה יְמוֹת?! וְעוֹד, חֲטָאת שְׁעֵבֶרָה שְׁנֵתָה – לְרַעֲיָה אֲזֵלָא! דְּאָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: חֲטָאת שְׁעֵבֶרָה שְׁנֵתָה – רוֹאִין אוֹתָהּ כְּאִילוֹ הִיא עוֹמֶדֶת בְּבֵית הַקְּבָרוֹת וְרוּעָה.

The Gemara asks: Is it right that **due to a rabbinic decree the offerings should be left to die** instead of being left to graze? **And furthermore, a sin-offering whose year has passed is not left to die but rather goes to graze. As Reish Lakish said: We consider a sin-offering whose year has passed^H as though it stands in a cemetery,^N and the priest cannot take it out in order to sacrifice it because he is not permitted to become ritually defiled. Therefore, it grazes until it becomes unfit and is then sold.**

אֲלֵא אָמַר רַבָּא: גִּזְרָה מִשּׁוֹם תְּקֵלָה. אִין מְקַדִּישִׁין וְאִין מְעַרְיְכִין וְאִין מְחַרְמִין בְּזִמְן הַזֶּה.

Rather, Rava said: The bull and goat of Yom Kippur may not be left from one year to the next by rabbinic decree **due to a concern that a mishap may occur. As it was taught in a baraita: One may neither consecrate objects, nor valuate, i.e., take a vow to donate one's value to the Temple treasury, nor dedicate items for sacred use at this time,^H when the Temple no longer exists.**

HALAKHA

It is extended for the benefit of the seller – נִתְעַבְּרָה לְמוֹכֵר: One who sells a house in a walled city during a leap year has until the completion of the thirteen-month year to redeem his house (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 12:5).

A sin-offering whose year has passed – חֲטָאת שְׁעֵבֶרָה: A sin-offering whose year has passed is left to graze until it becomes unfit. It is then sold and the money is used to purchase another offering (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:7).

Consecrated property nowadays – הַקֹּדֶשׁ בְּזִמְן הַזֶּה: Nowadays, when the Temple is no longer standing, one may not consecrate items, take valuation vows, or dedicate items for sacred use by the priests. If one does consecrate an animal, it is locked up and left to die on its own. If agricultural produce or garments are consecrated, they are left to rot. If money or metal vessels are consecrated, they are cast into the sea or they may be redeemed and the money destroyed (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramim* 8:8).