

21 Nissan 5778
April 6, 2018



Horayos Daf 6

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishna

The Gemora cites a braisa: Rabbi Shimon said: What was the purpose for stating (*by the two bulls brought by the Leviim upon their inauguration to serve in the Temple*): *And a second young bull you shall take for a chatas*? If it is to teach us that there were two, surely, it was already stated: *And you shall offer the one bull for a chatas and the other for an olah for Hashem!* Rather, the purpose of the verse is this: You might have thought that this chatas was to be eaten by the Leviim, it was therefore stated: *And a second young bull*, implying that it is second (*similar*) to the olah; just as the olah must not be eaten, also the chatas is not eaten.

Similarly, said Rabbi Yosi: *The children of the captivity, that were coming out of exile, brought olah offerings to the God of Israel, twelve bulls . . . all of them as an olah offering.* Is it possible that all of them were burnt offerings (*when the verse expressly states that there were twelve goats were chataos*)? Can a chatas be an olah?! Rather, this is the meaning: They were like an olah; just as an olah must not be eaten, so too the chatas was not eaten. For it was taught in a braisa: Rabbi Yehudah said: They brought them for the sin of idolatry.

Furthermore, Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: [They brought them] for the sin of idolatry that had been committed in the days of Tzidkiyahu.

The Gemora asks: According to Rabbi Yehudah one can well understand these twelve chatas offerings to be possible in the case, for example, where the sin was committed by

twelve tribes who must bring twelve goats — or again where the sin was committed by seven tribes where others must bring offerings on account of them. According to Rabbi Shimon, also, this is possible in the case, for example, where the sin was committed by eleven tribes who bring eleven goats, the twelfth being that of the court, According to Rabbi Meir, however, who said that the court, and not the congregation, bring the chatas offering, how could [the bringing of] twelve offerings be possible?

The Gemora answers: In the case, for instance, where they sinned, and sinned again and again unto the twelfth time.

The Gemora asks (on the braisa cited above): But surely, those who had committed the sin (in the time of Tzidkiyahu) were dead (when the exiles returned to Eretz Yisroel)?

Rav Pappa replied: The tradition that a chatas offering the owner of which died must be left to die, is applicable only to the offering of an individual, but not to that of a congregation — because a congregation does not die.

From where does Rav Pappa derive this law? If it be suggested, from the Scriptural verse: *Instead of your fathers shall be your sons*, if so, [it may be asked], this should apply to the offering of an individual also! — Rather Rav Pappa draws his inference from the goat of tRosh Chodesh concerning which the All Merciful said that it was to be brought from the funds of the Temple treasury. But surely, some of Israel had died, how then could those who survived bring [the Rosh Chodesh chatas offering]? From this it must



consequently be inferred that a chatas offering of the congregation — whose owners had died, may be offered.

The Gemora asks: Are these at all alike? [In the case of] the goat for the Rosh Chodesh it is possible that none of the congregation had died, but here [the owners] had certainly died!

Rav Pappa's proof, however, is derived from here: Because it is written: *Atone for your nation Israel that You have redeemed Hashem* [which implies that] this offering is fit to atone even for those who departed from Egypt, for it is written: *that You have redeemed*.

The Gemora asks: Is this, however, a proper analogy? There they were all present, and since [the heifer] atones for the living it may also atone for the dead: here, however, were there any survivors?

The Gemora answers: Yes; there were indeed, for it is written: *But many of the Kohanim and Leviim and heads of families*, etc.

The Gemora asks: Is it not possible that they were only a minority and not a majority?

The Gemora answers: Surely it is written: *So that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people. . . . and the noise was heard afar off*.

The Gemora asks: Were they not, however, willful sinners?

The Gemora answers: That was a [special] ruling of the moment. This may also be arrived at by reasoning, for should this not be granted, on whose behalf, [it may be asked,] were the ninety-six rams and seventy-seven lambs? Rather, [it must be granted, that] it was a ruling of the moment; in this respect also it must have been a ruling of the moment.

Our Rabbis taught: If one of the congregation died, they are still liable; if one of the court, they are exempt. Who is the author [of this statement]? — Rav Chisda, in the name of Rabbi Zeira in the name of Rabbi Yirmiyah, in the name of Rav, said: It is Rabbi Meir who maintains that the court, and not the congregation, bring the chatas offering. Hence, when one of the congregation dies they are still liable since all the members of the court are alive; if, however, one of the court dies they are exempt, because it is then a chatas offering one of whose joint owners died; and for this reason they are exempt.

Rav Yosef demurred: Let this statement be established in accordance with the view of Rabbi Shimon who maintains that the court together with the congregation [bring the chatas offering]. Hence, when one of the congregation dies, they are still liable because a congregation does not die; if one of the court dies they are exempt for the reason given, because it is a chatas offering [one] of [whose] joint owners [died]!

Abaye said to him: We have heard Rabbi Shimon say that a chatas offering in joint ownership is not to be left to die; for it was taught: If the bullock and the goat of Yom Kippur were lost and others were set aside in their stead, all these must be left to die; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon said: They shall be left to the pasture, because no congregational chatas offering may be left to die.

Rav Yosef said to him: Do you speak of Kohanim! Kohanim are different, because they are called 'congregation'; for it is written: *And he shall make atonement for the Kohanim and for all the people of the congregation*.

The Gemora asks: If so, however, let them also bring a bullock in the case of an erroneous ruling! And if it be said that this is really the case, then there would be more tribes!³

Rather, said Rav Acha, son of Rabbi Yaakov: The tribe of Levi is not called 'congregation,' for it is written: *Behold, I will make you fruitful and I will make you many, and I will make of you a congregation of peoples*, etc. He who has a possession (in Eretz Yisroel) is designated 'congregation,' but he who has no possession is not designated 'congregation.'

The Gemora asks: If so, there would be less than twelve tribes!

Abaye replied: *Ephraim and Menasheh, even as Reuven and Shimon, shall be mine.*

Said Rava: But, surely, it is written: *They shall be called after the name of their brethren it, their inheritance*, [which shows that] they were compared only in regard to 'inheritance' but not in any other respect!

The Gemora counters: Were they not? Surely, they were also separated [when mentioned] in [connection with] the banners!

The Gemora answers: Their campings were like their possessions.

Another answer: In order to show respect to their banners.

The Gemora asks: But, surely, they were also separated in respect of (the offerings brought by) their Nesiim!

The Gemora answers: That was done in order to show honor to the Nesiim, as it was taught: King Solomon celebrated seven days of dedication; what reason did Moshe have for celebrating twelve days of dedication? In order to show honor to the Nesiim.

The Gemora asks: What becomes of that (whether R' Shimon treats a chatas of partners like a communal offering, or not)?

Come and hear that which has been taught: Rabbi Shimon said: The following five kinds of chatas offerings are to be left to die: The young of a chatas offering, the exchange of a chatas offering, a chatas offering whose owner died, a chatas offering whose owner has received atonement and a chatas offering that passed the age of a year. And since in the case of a congregation one cannot speak of the young of a chatas offering, because no female offering is ever brought by a congregation; and one cannot speak of an exchange of a chatas offering in the case of a congregation because a congregation may not exchange an offering; and one cannot speak, in the case of a congregation, of a chatas offering whose owner died because a congregation does not die; while as regards one whose owner had received atonement and one that passed the age of a year we have not heard; one might suppose that they should be left to die, it is, therefore, pointed out that what is vague may be inferred from what is explicit; as in regard to the law of the young of a chatas offering, the exchange of a chatas offering and one whose owner had died we find that it applies only to an individual owner and not to a congregation, so also the law in regard to the case of one whose owner has received atonement and one that passed the age of a year it is applicable to an individual and not to a congregation.

The Gemora asks: But may that which is possible be deduced from that which is impossible?

The Gemora answers: Rabbi Shimon received the tradition [in regard to the five kinds of chatas offering that they must be left to die] from one common source.

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HORU BEIS DIN

MISHNAH. An anointed Kohen Gadol who made a decision for himself through error and acted unwittingly accordingly, must bring a chatas offering of a bullock. If, however, he made the decision through error but acted upon it willfully, or made it willfully but acted upon it unwittingly, he is



exempt; for a decision a Kohen Gadol made for himself is like a ruling issued by the court to the congregation.

GEMARA. Through error and acted unwittingly accordingly must bring a chatas offering of a bullock.

The Gemora asks: Isn't this obvious?

Abaye replied: The case dealt with here is one, for example, where he made a decision and forgot on what ground his decision had been made, and at the time of his action he declared, "I am acting on the strength of my decision;" in view of the fact that [in such a case] it might be assumed that, since, had he recollected he might have retracted, he is like a willful sinner and, therefore, not liable to a chatas offering, hence it was taught [that it is not so].

DAILY MASHAL

We must endeavor to understand the uniqueness of Ephraim and Menashe, which causes them to be considered the paradigm for blessing. While it is true that they remained virtuous and G-d fearing in the land of Egypt, are we to ignore Reuven, Shimon, Levi, etc.?

Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum cites the following exposition: Klal Yisrael has been subjected to pain and suffering at the hands of our "host" nations. Indeed, many have said that the only way to avoid affliction is to acculturate, to assimilate our Torah way of life and become like "them." Suppose, one were to react to these people saying, "Repent! Raise your children according to the derech ha'Torah, Torah way of life; let them be like Yaakov's sons, Reuven, Shimon, or Levi. The likely response would be, "How can you expect us to raise such "frum," religious, children in contemporary society? We have to be out in the community. Ghettozation is a thing of the past. If we have to live with the gentiles, we have no recourse but to follow in their ways."

We cannot ignore this rationalization. Yaakov raised his sons in a utopian, spiritual environment. They were never exposed to the harmful effects of the "street." They were never compelled to live among people who were morally degenerate and spiritually deficient. How can we expect these people to raise a "Reuven" or "Shimon"?

It is specifically for this reason that Yaakov Avinu chose Ephraim and Menashe as his paradigms for blessing. They were two young men, raised in Egyptian society and culture. They probably dressed and spoke in contemporary style. Nevertheless, they were Bnei Torah, virtuous, pious and totally committed to the way of life of their grandfather. They demonstrated that one could be observant even in Egypt! Klal Yisrael can maintain a Torah lifestyle and adhere to mitzvah observance "b'mlo muvan ha'milah," "to the full meaning of the word." We observe this from Yosef's sons who virtually stood on the same spiritual plateau as Yaakov's sons. Ephraim and Menashe have given hope to parents throughout the millennia who have been challenged to raise children in the filth of galus, exile.

How did Yosef do it? How was he able to raise such G-d-fearing sons amidst the moral depravation that permeated Egypt? We suggest there is only one way: Yosef lived in Egypt; Egypt did not live within Yosef! While he was compelled to leave his home to "work" in the halls of Egyptian society, his home was rendered impervious to the street. Yosef's home was replete with the same kedushah and taharah, holiness and purity, that imbued Yaakov's home. The "old world" values and ideals that had been infused in him in his childhood were a critical factor in the manner in which he raised his children. The medium that was the vehicle for carrying Egyptian filth into the homes did not enter his home. Egypt ended at his doorway. We should realize that the blessing of "May Hashem make you like Ephraim and Menashe" could only take effect if we raise our children like Yosef did.