



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

Horayos Daf Vuv

- A Braisa regarding the two parim that were brought by the Levi'im at the time of their installation says, **R' Shimon** says, why does the pasuk say "upar sheini ben bakar tikach l'chatas"? It can't be to teach that there are two separate parim, because the pasuk already says "va'asei es ha'echad chatas v'es ha'echad olah LaShem"!? Rather, we would have thought that the chatas should be eaten by the Levi'im. The pasuk of "upar sheini" teaches that the chatas is treated like the olah – just as the olah is not eaten, this chatas is not eaten as well. Similarly **R' Yose** said, the pasuk regarding the Yidden who went back to EY after the Galus Bavel says that they brought Olos to Hashem, brought 12 parim, etc., and then says "all of them an Olah". Now, the pasuk says that the 12 parim were brought for a chatas, so how can the pasuk say they were Olos? Rather, they were all like an Olah in the sense that they were not eaten. A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** explains, that these chatas were brought for the sin of avoda zara done by the tzibbur, and that is why they were not to be eaten. **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** explained, that the sin was committed in the times of Tzikkياهو (before going into galus).
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda** we can say that they brought 12 parim because all of the shevatim sinned, and that is why each shevet had to bring their own chatas, or we can say that 7 shevatim sinned and still all 12 shevatim had to bring a chatas, because of the concept of greira (as explained previously). According to **R' Shimon** we can say that the case is that 11 shevatim sinned, which required each of them to bring a chatas and the 12th par was brought by Beis Din (presumably for making the erroneous psak that caused these sins). However, according to **R' Meir** that it is Beis Din who brings the par, and not the tzibbur, how do we get to a total of 12 parim? **A:** The case is that they sinned, and sinned again, and again, for a total of 12 times, each time requiring a separate korbon to be brought.
 - **Q:** How can they have brought a chatas for the people who sinned in the times of Tzidkiyahu? Those people were no longer alive at that time (and a chatas can't be brought for someone who is no longer alive, and the animal would actually have to be left to die)!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, a chatas is only left to die when its owner was an *individual* who died, but in this case it was the tzibbur, and "a tzibbur doesn't die" (is never considered to die).
 - **Q:** How does **R' Pappa** know this? It can't be from the pasuk of "tachas avosecha yihiyu banecha" (which says that the children of sinners stand in their place), because then even an individual's chatas should be brought by his children! **A:** Rather, he learns it from the fact that the chatas of Rosh Chodesh is brought from the communal fund, even though there are some of the community who have died since the collection of the fund.
 - **Q:** With regard to Rosh Chodesh we can say that it is *possible* that no one has died, but in this case after the galus, we know for certain that there were people who died!? **A:** Rather, he learns it from the eglah arufah, which the pasuk says serves as a kapara for the people who left Mitzrayim ("kaper l'amcha Yisrael asher padisa Hashem") even though they are no longer alive.
 - **Q:** The case of the eglah arufa is different, because it principally serves as a kapara for the people who are present at the time, and once it serves as a kapara for the living it can also be said to serve as a kapara for those who are no longer alive. However, in the case of the chatas brought after the galus, all the people who needed the kapara were no longer alive!? **A:** We learn from the pesukim that many of the people

were actually still alive, and in fact, we see from a pasuk that these people were the majority present at the time.

- **Q:** The people who sinned at that time did so b'meizid, so how can they bring a chatas!? **A:** This was a "hora'as sha'ah". We must say so, as we see that there were a number of other korbanos that were brought that cannot be explained other than to say that this was a hora'as sha'ah.
- A Braisa says, if one of the people of the tzibur died after the sin (that caused the par helam to be required) was committed, they are still chayuv to bring the par helam. If one of the members of Beis Din died, they are no longer chayuv.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna of this Braisa? **A: R' Chisda in the name of R' Zeira in the name of R' Yirmiya in the name of Rav** said, it is **R' Meir**, who says that it is Beis Din who must bring the par helam. Therefore, even if one of the tzibbur dies it must be brought, because the Beis Din is still in existence. But, if one of the dayanim die it is not brought, because it is a chatas of partners where one of the partners died, and that is why they are patur.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, why can't we say that the Tanna of the Braisa is **R' Shimon**, who says that Beis Din brings the korbon as well as the tzibbur, and when one of the tzibbur dies they are still chayuv, because the "tzibbur doesn't die", but when one of the dayanim die they are patur, because their korbon is a korbon of partners? **A: Abaye** said, we see from a Braisa regarding the korbon of Yom Kippur (which is owned in partnership by the Kohanim) that **R' Shimon** holds it would not be left to die, but is rather treated like a chatas of the tzibbur. Therefore, the earlier Braisa cannot reflect his view.
 - **R' Yosef** said, you can't bring a proof from the Yom Kippur chatas of the Kohanim, because we find that Kohanim are referred to as a "kahal" in a pasuk, and that is why their korbon is treated like the korbon of the tzibbur rather than a korbon of a partnership. However, **R' Shimon** would agree that the korbon of Beis Din would not be brought if one of the dayanim died. Therefore, the Braisa can be the view of **R' Shimon**!
 - **Q:** If Kohanim are considered to be a "kahal", they should have to bring their own par helam, and **R' Shimon** has said that the maximum amount brought is 13 – 12 for the shevatim and one for Beis Din!? **A: R' Acha the son of R' Yaakov** said, although they are a kahal for purposes of giving their chatas the status of a chatas of the tzibbur, they are part of Shevet Levi, who is not considered to be a kahal for other purposes. We learn this from a pasuk that connects the term "kahal" to inheritance of a share in EY. Since Shevet Levi did not get a share in EY, they are not given the status of "kahal" for other purposes.
 - **Q:** If Shevet Levi is not a kahal they would not bring a par helam. If so, we don't have 12 shevatim bringing a par helam!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk of "Efraim u'Menasheh k'Reuven v'Shimon yihyu li" teaches that Shevet Yosef is split into two – Efraim and Menasheh – and that is how we get to 12 shevatim.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, the pasuk says "ahl shem acheyhem yikaru b'nachalasam", which teaches that Efraim and Menasheh are only considered separate shevatim with regard to matters of inheritance, but not for other matters!?
 - **Q:** We find they are separated for the "degalm" (the flags and the formation of the way they were placed when travelling)!? **A:** That is because the degalm were set up based on the way they were to inherit EY. That is why they were separate for that purpose as well.
 - **Q:** We find that they are separated for purposes of the Nasi – each having its own Nasi!? **A:** That was done to give honor to the Nessi'im, so that one of these two would not have to be passed over for the other.

- **Q:** How do we come out – does **R' Shimon** treat the chatas of partners like the chatas of a tzibbur, in which case it could still be brought if one of the partners died? **A:** A Braisa discusses the 5 cases of where a chatas must be left to die. **R' Shimon** explained that 3 of these cases can't happen by the chatas of a tzibbur (e.g. one of the cases is regarding the offspring of a chatas, but the chatas of a tzibbur is a male and therefore can't have offspring born to it). He says, that the other two cases will therefore also not apply to a chatas of the tzibbur, because either all 5 cases apply or all 5 don't apply. Similarly, we will say that since regarding the partner's chatas not all 5 cases can apply (it is also a male and cannot have offspring and it is also not subject to the concept of "temurah"), none of the 5 cases will apply and it is therefore treated like the chatas of the tzibbur.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HORU BEIS DIN!!!