



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

Horayos Daf Yud Aleph

- A Braisa says, the words “*mei’am haaretz*” written regarding an individual’s chatas comes to exclude a Kohen Gadol. Another drasha is that it comes to exclude a Nasi. We can ask that they are already excluded by the fact that the Torah tells us that a Kohen Gadol brings a par and a Nasi brings a male goat (which are different than an individual’s chatas). The answer is, that we would think the Kohen Gadol only brings the par when his sin is based on his erroneous psak, but when it is a simple shogeig we would think that he may bring the chatas of an individual. Therefore the pasuk says “*mei’am haaretz*” to exclude him even in this case.
 - **Q:** This answer makes sense regarding the Kohen Gadol, but not for the Nasi, since the Nasi brings his korbon for a simple shogeig!? **A:** **R’ Zvid in the name of Rava** answered, the case is where the Nasi ate a kezayis of cheilev before he became Nasi, then became the Nasi, and then realized that he ate the cheilev. We would think that he is to bring the individual’s chatas. The Braisa teaches that he does not.
 - **Q:** This makes sense according to **R’ Shimon** who says that we follow the time of knowledge of the sin. However, according to the **Rabanan** who only look to the time of the sin itself, in this case he would bring the individual’s chatas!? **A:** Rather, **R’ Zvid in the name of Rava** said, the case would be where he ate half a kezayis of cheilev as an individual, was then appointed Nasi, and then completed the kezayis and realized what he had done. We would think that the two halves should combine to make him chayuv an individual’s chatas. The pasuk teaches that he is not chayuv.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked **R’ Nachman**, does becoming Nasi make a separation? For example, if he ate half a zayis of cheilev as an individual, was then appointed Nasi and was removed from Nasi, and then completed the kezayis (all within kidei achilas pras). Do we say that in the previous case the two halves don’t combine because he had a different status when he ate each half, but in this case he has the same status and therefore they combine, or do we say that even here they will not combine? **A:** We can answer from what **Ulla** said in the name of **R’ Yochanan**, that if someone ate “cheilev”, separated a korbon chatas to bring for the aveirah, and then became a “mumar”, and he then came back to Judaism, he cannot use that korbon, because once it was pushed away it remains pushed away. The same should be said regarding the korbon for this person once he became Nasi.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof. In **R’ Yochanan’s** case, since a mumar is not fit to bring a korbon, it is considered to be pushed away. However, in the case of the Nasi, he is fit to bring a korbon, only a different type. Therefore, the cases are not comparable.
 - **Q:** **R’ Zeira** asked **R’ Sheishes**, if a person ate safek cheilev and was then appointed Nasi and then realized that he ate safek cheilev, would he be chayuv to bring an asham taluy? According to the **Rabanan** who say we follow the time of the sin it is clear that he would be chayuv. The question is according to **R’ Shimon** – do we say that since in the case of a chatas his change in status makes him patur the same is true for an asham taluy, or do we say that he becomes patur from a chatas only because his korbon changes along with his status, but since his asham taluy does not change along with his status he would remain chayuv? **TEIKU**.
- A Braisa darshens “*mei’ahm haaretz ba’asosah*” to teach that one who is a mumar would not bring a chatas if he does an aveira b’shogeig. **R’ Shimon bar Yose in the name of R’ Shimon** said, we don’t need that pasuk for that, because we darshen another pasuk to teach that only

someone who would stop from doing the aveira if he knew he was doing an aveira brings a chatas for doing that aveira. A person who would not stop does not bring a korbon.

- **Q:** What's the difference between these drashos? **A: R' Hamnuna** said, the difference would be one who was a mumar to eat cheilev, but who mistakenly ate blood. The **T"K** would hold that he is considered to be a mumar regarding blood as well and therefore could not bring a korbon. **R' Shimon bar Yose in the name of R' Shimon** would hold that since he would stop eating blood if he knew what he was doing, he would bring a korbon for having eaten blood.
 - **Q: Rava** has said that all agree that one who is a mumar to eat cheilev would not be considered a mumar for eating blood!? **A:** Rather, the machlokes would be regarding a person who eats neveila "l'tei'avon" who thought he was eating kosher fats and mistakenly ate cheilev. The **T"K** holds that since he eats l'tei'avon b'meizid, he is considered to be a mumar and can't bring a korbon. **R' Shimon** holds that since if he had mutar meat he would not eat assur meat, he is not considered to be a mumar (and he therefore could bring a chatas).
- A Braisa says, one who eats cheilev is a mumar. Who is a mumar? One who eats neveilos, treifos, shkatzim, or remasim or drinks yayin nesech. **R' Yose the son of Yehuda** says, also someone who wears kilayim.
 - **Q:** The Braisa first defines a mumar and then asks who is a mumar!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the Braisa means to say, if one eats cheilev l'tei'avon, he is a mumar. If he does so "l'hachis" he is a Tzedoki. The Braisa then asks, who is the mumar that is typically a Tzedoki? It is one who eats neveilos, treifos, shkatzim, or remasim or drinks yayin nesech.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between the **T"K** and **R' Yose**? **A:** The difference would be regarding klayim D'Rabanan. The **T"K** holds that only when it is assur D'Oraisa does it make him a mumar, and **R' Yose** says that since kilayim is a well-known issur, he is a mumar even if it is only assur D'Rabanan.
- We have learned, with regard to a "mumar" there is a machlokes between **R' Acha and Ravina** – one says that a mumar who eats neveilos for pleasure is called a mumar, and one who eats neveilos simply to defy the Torah is considered to be a "Tzedoki". The other says that even one who eats neveilos simply to defy the Torah is considered to be a mumar, and a "Tzedoki" would be one who worships avoda zara.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person eats a flea or a gnat he is a mumar. Now, this person would clearly be one who eats these things simply to defy the Torah (there is no pleasure in eating these things) and the Braisa says that he is considered to be a mumar. This refutes the first view!? **A:** This person wants to taste something that is assur, and gets pleasure from doing so. That is why he is considered to be a mumar.

V'EIZEHU NASI ZEH MELECH...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says a "Nasi" brings a special chatas. We would think this even applies to the nasi of every shevet. The pasuk therefore says "mikol mitzvos Hashem Elokav" and a pasuk regarding a king says "l'maan yilmad l'yira es Hashem Elokav". The gezeira shava teaches that the Nasi referred to in the pasuk is the king.
 - **Rebbi** asked **R' Chiya**, would I bring the korbon of the Nasi (**Rebbi** was the Nasi in EY, and was considered to be the ruler)? **R' Chiya** said, you have a counterpart in Bavel (the Reish Galusa) and therefore you are not one who only has Hashem above you. **Rebbi** asked, when there was a King of Yisrael and a King of Beis Dovid they would each bring the korbon of the Nasi, so we see that even when there are two rulers each brings the special korbon!? **R' Chiya** said, there the kings are of equal power, but here, we are subordinate to the Reish Galusa.
 - **R' Safra** had a version where **R' Chiya** answered that the Reish Galusa is referred to as the "leader" in the pasuk of "lo yasur shevet mi'Yehuda" whereas you, the nasi, are referred to as the "legislator" in the pasuk – "mechokeik mibein raglav". Therefore you would not bring the korbon of the Nasi.

MISHNA

- Who is the “Kohen Moshia” (who brings the par for a chatas based on his erroneous ruling)? It is the Kohen Gadol who is anointed with the shemen hamishcha, and not a Kohen Gadol who was installed by donning the special clothing of the Kohen Gadol (which is what was done during the Second Beis Hamikdash).
- There is no difference between a Kohen Gadol who was anointed with the “shemen hamishcha” and one installed just by putting on the clothing of a Kohen Gadol, except that the latter would not bring the special chatas that is brought by a Kohen Gadol when he paskens wrong and sins based on that.
- There is no difference between a Kohen Gadol who is currently in office, and one who is no longer in office, except that only the one currently in office brings the special par on Yom Kippur, and the special Korban Mincha brought by the Kohen Gadol each day. They are both equal with regard to doing the Avodah for the rest of Yom Kippur, are both commanded to only marry a besulah, are both assur to marry an almanah, both are assur to become tamei even to their immediate relatives or to let their hair grow long or rip their clothing in mourning, and the death of either of them frees the one who is in galus for having killed b’shogeg.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** said, the shemen hamishcha made by Moshe in the Midbar would be made by boiling the roots of spices in olive oil. **R’ Yose** said, there was not enough oil in which to boil the roots (the roots would absorb all the oil)! Rather, they would first soak the roots in water and then pour the oil over them, thereby imparting their fragrance into the oil, and Moshe would then wipe the oil off the roots and save it with the other oil. **R’ Yehuda** said, you think there was only one miracle done with the shemen hamishcha!? It was made with only 12 lug of oil, and it was used to anoint the entire Mishkan and all its keilim, Aharon and his sons all 7 days of the Milu’im, and will still exist in full in the future!
 - Another Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** said, many miracles happened with the shemen hamishcha from beginning to end. It was made with only 12 lug of oil, and although a pot absorbs, and roots absorb, and the fire causes evaporation, this oil was used to anoint the entire Mishkan and all its keilim, Aharon and his sons all 7 days of the Milu’im, and to anoint Kohanim Gedolim and kings – in the case of a Kohen Gadol he would need to be anointed even if his father was also the Kohen Gadol, but in the case of a king, if his father was king he would not have to be anointed, and although we find such kings who were anointed, like Shlomo, that was because there were those who contested their kingship – and yet this oil remains in full existence for future times, as the pasuk says “shemen mishchas kodesh yihyeh zeh li l’doroseichem”, and the word “zeh” is gematriya 12, for the 12 lugin of oil that were used.
 - **Q:** How do we know that a Kohen Gadol must be anointed even if his father was the Kohen Gadol? **A:** The pasuk says “v’haKohen hamashi’ach tachtav mibanav”. This teaches that even if he is the child of a Kohen Gadol he must be “mashi’ach” – anointed.
 - **Q:** How do we know that a king is not anointed if his father was the king? **A:** **R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, the pasuk talks of a king as if it is an inheritance to his children. Therefore, a son does not need to be anointed.
 - **Q:** How do we know that when there is a dispute regarding the kingship even the king’s son must be anointed? **A:** **R’ Pappa** said, the pasuk says “hu ubanav b’kerev Yisrael”, which teaches that when there is shalom among Klal Yisrael there is automatic passing of the kingship from father to son, but where there is not shalom, it does not pass in this way.
 - A Braisa says that Yeihu ben Nimshi did not need to be anointed to become king but was anointed because of the fight with Yehoram.
 - **Q:** Why can’t we say that he needed to be anointed because his father was not the king? **A:** The Braisa is missing words and should say that only kings of Beis Dovid are anointed, but kings of Yisrael are not. Therefore, the only reason that Yeihu, who was a king in Yisrael, was anointed was because of the argument with Yehoram.

- **Rava** said, the pasuk in which Hashem tells Shmuel to anoint Dovid uses the word “zeh”, which teaches it is only this one (Dovid’s dynasty) who needs anointing, but not the kings of Yisrael.
- **Q:** If a king of Yisrael is not supposed to be anointed, how could they be oiver me’ilah with the oil and anoint Yeihu just because of the argument with Yehoram? **A:** It is as **R’ Pappa** says elsewhere, that they anointed him with other oil, not Moshe’s shemen hamishchah.
- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that Yeho’achaz should not have been anointed, because he was the son of a king, but he was anointed because he was two years younger than his brother Yehoyakam. Now, a pasuk says that Yoshiyahu had 4 sons: Yochanan, Yehoyakim, Tzidkiyahu and Shalum. **R’ Yochanan** says, Yochanan was Yeho’achaz and the pasuk says that Yeho’achaz was the bechor!? **A:** He was the “bechor for the kingship”, but was actually not the oldest brother.
 - **Q:** A pasuk seems to teach that the other brother was supposed to get the kingship, so why did Yeho’achaz get it? **A:** He was more worthy of the throne than his older brother.
 - **Q: R’ Yochanan** also said that “Shalum” was Tzidkiyahu. How can that be when the pasuk lists them separately!? **A:** He is listed as 3rd, because he was the 3rd of the brothers. He was listed as 4th, because he was fourth to be king (after each of his two brothers were king, his nephew became king).
 - A Braisa says he was called Shalum because he was perfect in his deeds. Others say it was because the Davidic dynasty ended in his days. His true name was Matanya, but Nevuchadnetzar called him Tzidkiyahu as if to say, “Hashem should justify my judgment on you if you rebel against me”.
 - **Q:** How can it be that the shemen hamishchah was around at the time that Yeho’achaz took the throne? A Braisa says that Yoshiyahu hid the shemen hamishcha along with the Aron and many other special items. This happened before his son Yeho’achaz took the throne!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, he was anointed with balsam oil, not with Moshe’s shemen hamishcha.