



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 *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa* that explains why Rabbi Yosi Hagellili exempts a Nasi from the *olah v'yoreid* - sliding scale sacrifice. Rabbi Yirmiyah says in the *Baraisa* 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 Nasi and an Anointed Kohen, for they cannot come to a state of poverty. As to a Nasi — it is written: And does any one of all the things which Hashem his God has commanded, [implying], he above whom there is none but Hashem his God; as to an Anointed Kohen — it is written: And the Kohen that is highest among his brethren, [meaning,] who is greatest among his brethren in beauty, strength, wisdom and wealth. Others say: From where is it proved that if he has nothing of his own he must be made to be greater than his brethren? For it was expressly stated: And the Kohen that is highest among his brethren upon whose head [the anointing oil] is poured, he must be made greater than his brethren. (8b5 – 9a1)

Ravina inquired of Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak whether a Nasi who was deposed since he had *tzara'as* is now obligated in an *olah v'yoreid* for a transgression while he was Nasi. Do we consider the obligation to have been truly removed, to never return, or simply pushed aside only while he was Nasi? He answered: Would it be from your funds or from his coffers (i.e., the deposed Nasi is still rich from his original treasury, and therefore still exempt). (9a1 – 9a2)

***Kohen Mashiach's Exemption***

The *Gemara* cites a *Baraisa* 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*.

Might it not be suggested that the Merciful One has exempted him only from the poorest offering which is a tenth part of an *eifah* but not [from those other offerings that are brought in case of] poverty and wealth! — This cannot be imagined at all, for it is written: And the Kohen shall make atonement for his sin that he has committed in any of these things – whoever may receive atonement by every one of these may also receive atonement by any of the others, but whoever may not obtain atonement by every one of these may not obtain atonement by any of the others. - Now, however, since it is written: And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, is the meaning there also that whoever is liable for every one of these can also become liable for any of the others and whoever is not liable for every one of these cannot become liable for the others! Why then have we learned that Rabbi Akiva said: A Nasi is liable for all except for hearing of the voice [of adjuration]? — Abaye and Rava both 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. - But why is ‘in any’ regarded as proof? — Because the Merciful One has written in at the end in connection with the law of the tenth part of an *eifah*; thus indicating that whoever is liable to bring the tenth part of an *eifah* can also come under the

obligation to bring any of the others. For could it have been – 9a4)

imagined that a person may be

liable for one of these offerings [alone] although he cannot become liable for any of the others, in any of these things should have been written either in connection with the offering to the poor or with that for the rich! (9a2 – 9a3)

### ***Sacrifices – who, what?***

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

Transgression	Person	Sacrifice
Ones punishable by kares when intentional	Individual	Female lamb or goat
	Nasi	Male goat
	Anointed Kohen	Bull
	Court	
Idolatry	Individual	Female lamb
	Nasi	
	Anointed Kohen	
	Court	Bull (olah), goat (chatas)

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

The *Mishnah* 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, Nasi, and Anointed Kohen are. Rabbi Shimon says that the Anointed Kohen is not obligated for *Mikdash* and *kodesh*. Rabbi Eliezer says the Nasi offers a male goat for the *olah v'yoreid* transgressions. (9a3

The *Gemara* cites Rabbi Shimon in a *Baraisa* who states the following rules:

1. For any transgression that obligates an individual an *asham taluy* - *pending guilt offering* (brought when one may have violated a *kares* transgression), the Nasi would also be obligated, but the court and Anointed Kohen are exempt.
2. For any transgression that obligates an individual an *asham*, the Nasi 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 Nasi and Anointed Kohen are obligated. The Nasi 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 Nasi is similarly obligated, but an Anointed Kohen and the court are exempt.

The *Gemara* says that the statements seem to be inconsistent. The third statement exempts the Anointed Kohen from an *olah v'yoreid* only 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 this is not a question: 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 *eifah minchah* besides his daily *minchah*, but does not agree with him on extending this exemption to the other levels of the *olah v'yoreid*. (9a4 – 9b1)

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

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

The *Gemara* 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 *Gemara* 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 an Anointed *Kohen* 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*. (9b1 – 9b2)

Rabbi Eliezer in the *Mishnah* says that the *Nasi* 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), *maNasi* it similar to a standard *chatas*. Just as a *Nasi* 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 *Nasi* brings *his* type of animal for all *olah v'yoreid* transgressions, the Anointed *Kohen* should also. However, if the *Nasi* 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 *Gemara* accepts this conclusion.

Rabbi Yochanan says that although Rabbi Eliezer considers *Mikdash* and *kodesh* to be similar to a standard *kares*, obligating the *Nasi* 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 *Baraisa* 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 *Baraisa*, since he considers this transgression to be like a standard *kares*. The *Gemara* notes that this is not consistent with Rabbi Yochanan's statement. (9b2 – 9b3)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HORA KOHEN MASHIACH

### *Change of Status*

The *Mishnah* says that if an Anointed *Kohen* or *Nasi* 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 *Nasi* who sinned after being deposed brings a female sheep or goat like a standard individual. (9b4)

The *Gemara* says that the *Mishnah'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 *Gemara* explains that since a *Nasi* only brings a goat if he sinned and was then deposed, the *Mishnah* had to spell out both cases. Once it listed both cases for the *Nasi*, it did so for the Anointed *Kohen* as well. (9b4 – 10a1)



## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### Former Nasi

Ravina asked Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak whether a Nasi 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 Nasi, but now that he is not Nasi, he is *chayav* – obligated.
2. *dachui* - his being Nasi 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 Nasi, and therefore obligated like any other individual
2. *dachui* – the *tzara'as* only temporarily pushes aside his royalty, but he is still technically a Nasi, 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 Nasi, 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 Nasi is limited to his remaining treasure. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak was saying that when he was Nasi, he had the right to seize anyone's property, *maNasi* him always rich, and unable to be poor. However, now that he is not the Nasi, 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.