



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

Rags and Riches

The Gemora cites a braisa that explains why Rabbi Yossi Haglili exempts a king from the *olah v'yoreid* - sliding scale sacrifice. Rabbi Yirmiyah says in the braisa that when the verse stipulates in the section of *olah v'yoreid* that if the person cannot afford a sheep, he brings birds, and if cannot even afford birds, he brings a meal offering, this limits the sacrifice to one who can possibly not afford something, i.e., can be poor. This excludes a king, who is always rich, and a *Kohen Gadol*, since the verse mandates that he be *Gadol mai'echav* – greater than his brothers in all ways – beauty, strength, intelligence, and riches. Others says that if he is not wealthy on his own, the other *Kohanim* must enrich him, as we can read the verse – *Gadol mai'echav* as greater from his brothers.

Ravina asked Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak whether a king who was deposed since he had *tzara'as* is now obligated in an *olah v'yoreid* for a transgression while he was king. Do we consider the obligation to have been truly removed, to never return, or simply pushed aside only while he was king? He answered that the deposed king is still rich from his original treasury, and therefore still exempt. (8b – 9a)

Kohen Mashiach's Exemption

The Gemora cites a braisa in which Rabbi Akiva says that the *Kohen mashiach* – Anointed *Kohen* is exempt from all *olah v'yoreid* sacrifices.

Rava explains that Rabbi Akiva learns this from the verse

about the daily tenth of *eifah minchah* sacrifice of the *Kohen Gadol*. The verse says *zeh* – this is the sacrifice of the *Kohanim*, limiting the *Kohen Gadol* to only this instance of a tenth of an *eifah* sacrifice, excluding the poorest level of *olah v'yoreid*, which is a tenth of *eifah minchah*. The Gemora explains that the verse for the poorest level states that the *Kohen* will atone for the person for his sin “from one of these.” This phrase teaches that only one who can bring any one of the levels can bring the *olah v'yoreid*.

Rava and Abaye explain that although the verse that introduces the *olah v'yoreid* similarly states “and it will be when he is guilty of one of these,” it does not require that one be able to transgress all of the sins in order to be obligated in an *olah v'yoreid* for any of them. The Gemora explains that only the verse about the poorest *minchah* limits the obligation, since it is specifically stated in that section, and not in the top two tiers. (9a)

Sacrifices – who, what?

The *Mishna* summarizes the sacrifice offered by various people for various transgressions.

Transgression	Person	Sacrifice
Ones punishable by kares when intentional	Individual	Female lamb or goat
	King	Male goat
	Anointed <i>Kohen</i>	Bull

	Court	
Idolatry	Individual	Female lamb
	King	
	Anointed Kohen	
	Court	Bull (<i>olah</i>), goat (<i>chatas</i>)

An individual, king, and Anointed Kohen are obligated in *asham* – *guilt* offerings when applicable, but the court is not.

The *Mishna* then lists the details of an *olah v'yoreid*, brought for the transgressions of falsely denying knowledge of testimony, being impure when in the *Mikdash* or eating sacrifices (*Mikdash and kodesh*), and violating an oath. The court is not obligated in this sacrifice, but an individual, king, and Anointed Kohen are. Rabbi Shimon says that the Anointed Kohen is not obligated for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*. Rabbi Eliezer says the king offers a male goat for the *olah v'yoreid* transgressions.

The *Gemora* cites Rabbi Shimon in a *braisa* who states the following rules:

1. For any transgression that obligates an individual an *asham talui* - *pending guilt offering* (brought when one may have violated a *kares* transgression), the king would also be obligated, but the court and Anointed Kohen are exempt.
2. For any transgression that obligates an individual an *asham*, the king and Anointed Kohen would be obligated, but the court is exempt.
3. For the three *olah v'yoreid* transgressions, the court is exempt, while a king and Anointed Kohen are obligated. The king is not obligated for denying knowledge of testimony, and the Anointed Kohen is not obligated for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*.
4. For any transgression that obligates an individual an *olah v'yoreid*, a king is similarly obligated, but an Anointed Kohen and the court are exempt.

The *Gemora* says that the statements seem to be inconsistent. The third statement only exempts the Anointed Kohen from an *olah v'yoreid* due to the transgression of *Mikdash* and *kodesh*, implying that he is obligated when he violates the other two transgressions. However, the fourth statement groups the Anointed Kohen with the court, implying that he is exempt from all three transgressions, like the court.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua explains that the Anointed Kohen is never obligated in the poorest sacrifice (*the minchah*), but is obligated in the other levels. He isn't obligated in any *olah v'yoreid* for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*. Rabbi Shimon agrees with Rabbi Akiva who limits the *Kohen Gadol* from offering any tenth of an *efah minchah* besides his daily *minchah*, but does not agree with him on extending this exemption to the other levels of the *olah v'yoreid*.

Chizkiyah explains that Rabbi Shimon exempts the Anointed Kohen from an *olah v'yoreid* for *Mikdash* and *kodesh* since the verse discussing this transgression states that the transgressing soul will be cut off from the *kahal* – *nation*, mandating that the person be one whose sacrifice is similar to the nation. Since the *Kohen Gadol* is atoned on *Yom Kippur* with his bull, not with the goat that atones for the nation, he is not similar to the nation, and is not obligated a sacrifice for this transgression.

The *Gemora* objects, since a king's sacrifice in the case of a *chatas* (goat) is different than the nation's sacrifice for an erroneous ruling (bull), yet the king is obligated an *olah v'yoreid* for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*.

The *Gemora* answers that on *Yom Kippur* the king is atoned with the same sacrifice as the nation.

The *Gemora* objects, since that would exclude all *Kohanim* from a sacrifice for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*, since they are also not atoned with the same sacrifice of the nation on *Yom*



Kippur.

Rather, the *Gemora* concludes that the requirement is that the person be similar to the *individuals* of the nation in the nature of act which obligates them in a *chatas*. Individuals in the nation are obligated in a *chatas* when they simply accidentally transgressed, even without any erroneous ruling, but a *Kohen Gadol* is only obligated if he ruled incorrectly. Therefore, he is not similar, and is therefore exempt from an *olah v'yoreid* for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*.

Rabbi Eliezer says that the king brings a goat for his *olah v'yoreid*. Rabbi Yochanan says that Rabbi Eliezer says this only for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*, since it is a *kares* transgression (when done intentionally), making it similar to a standard *chatas*. Just as a king brings a goat for a standard *chatas*, he brings one for the similar *olah v'yoreid* transgression.

Rav Pappa supports this from the fact that Rabbi Eliezer did not say that the Anointed *Kohen* offers a bull for an *olah v'yoreid*. If he says that a king brings *his* type of animal for all *olah v'yoreid* transgressions, the Anointed *Kohen* should also. However, if the king only brings it for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*, Rabbi Eliezer did not say that the Anointed *Kohen* brings a bull, since he is exempt for that transgression.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Nassan challenges Rav Pappa's support, suggesting that Rabbi Eliezer agrees with Rabbi Akiva, who exempts an Anointed *Kohen* from all *olah v'yoreid* sacrifices.

Rav Pappa rejects this, since even Rabbi Akiva agrees that he must bring a bull instead of the sliding *olah v'yoreid*, and the *Gemora* accepts this conclusion.

Rabbi Yochanan says that although Rabbi Eliezer considers *Mikdash* and *kodesh* to be similar to a standard *kares*, obligating the king in a goat, he agrees that one would not be obligated in a pending *asham* when he is in doubt of transgressing.

Someone in front of Rav Sheishes quoted a *braisa* which said that one brings a pending *asham* on a possibility of having transgressed *Mikdash* and *kodesh*, and Rav Sheishes told him that Rabbi Eliezer is the author of the *braisa*, since he considers this transgression to be like a standard *kares*. The *Gemora* notes that this is not consistent with Rabbi Yochanan's statement. (9a – 9b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HORA KOHEN MASHIACH

Change of Status

The *Mishna* says that if an Anointed *Kohen* or king sinned, and then lost his title, he still brings the original sacrifice (*bull or goat, respectively*). An Anointed *Kohen* who sinned after losing his title brings a bull, while a king who sinned after being deposed brings a female sheep or goat like a standard individual.

The *Gemora* says that the *Mishna's* second case of an Anointed *Kohen* who sinned after losing his title is necessary, since we may have thought he brings a standard sacrifice, but the first case is obvious, since he sinned while still being Anointed. The *Gemora* explains that since a king only brings a goat if he sinned and was then deposed, the *Mishna* had to spell out both cases. Once it listed both cases for the king, it did so for the Anointed *Kohen* as well. (9b – 10a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Former King

Ravina asked Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak whether a king who was removed due to *tzara'as* is obligated in an *olah v'yoreid* sacrifice. Do we consider him *dachui* – pushed aside, or *patur* – exempt?

Rashi says that the two options are:

1. *patur* - he is exempt only while he is king, but now that

he is not king, he is *chayav* – obligated.

2. *dachui* - his being king pushed aside the obligation and it does not return

The Reshash says that the question is what effect the *tzara'as* has on his royalty:

1. *patur* – he is permanently relieved of his duties as king, and therefore obligated like any other individual
2. *dachui* – the *tzara'as* only temporarily pushes aside his royalty, but he is still technically a king, and therefore exempt

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answered “should he take the money from his or your treasures?”

Rashi explains that he was answering that since the king, even when deposed, is still in possession of his former treasures, he is unable to be poor, and therefore exempt.

The Tosfos Rosh explains that since the treasures were originally from royalty, at which point he was unable to be poor, he still retains this status, even though the treasures are now technically only personal possessions. The Tosfos Rosh quotes the Rema who explains that the answer is the opposite, with the question emphasizing that the deposed king is limited to his remaining treasure. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak was saying that when he was king, he had the right to seize anyone’s property, making him always rich, and unable to be poor. However, now that he is not the king, he *cannot* take “your” treasure, and is limited to his remaining treasure. While it may be large, it is no different than any other rich individual who may become poor, and is therefore obligated.

DAILY MASHAL

Sliding Scale Korban

The Korban Asham, guilt-offering, of the metzora is the same regardless of the financial status of the individual who offers

it. Both the wealthy metzora and the poor metzora bring a male lamb as a guilt-offering. This is unlike the Korban Chatas, sin-offering, and Olah, elevation-offering, which are descending (*olah v'yoreid*) commensurate with the poor man's ability to pay. Horav Shmuel Rosenberg, zl, Rav in Unsdorf, offers an illuminating but practical insight. The Chatas and Olah are korbanos which are brought for various sins. While a sin is a sin - and a sinner is a sinner, regardless of his economic status, poor or rich, he must bring a korban as part of his penance. His ability to pay, however, is taken into consideration. The Torah is not out to gouge someone. Thus, he pays in accordance with his ability.

The sin that catalyzes a guilt-offering is different. *Negaim*, skin afflictions, are Heaven-sent to punish a person for specific sinful behavior - all of which are the result of *gasus ha'ruach*, vile, contemptuous vulgarity. A *gas ruach*, vulgar person, who arrogates over others, whose envy impels him to slander, whose self-absorbed nature leads him to look down upon others, is a contemptible person. If he has been blessed with wealth, he, at least, has something about which to arrogate. What does the wretched, poverty-stricken fellow have to arrogate about? Such a person who has descended into the depths of vulgarity is truly contemptuous. Let him pay for his korban. If he wants to "act" wealthy - let him pay.