



Par Kohen Mashiach

Horayot opens by discussing the unique *korban* – *par helem davar shel tzibur*. Simply put, this refers to the *korban* that must be brought if the *Sanhedrin* rules in error regarding a detail in a prohibition that is punishable by *karet*, leading most of the *tzibbur* (community) to violate this prohibition. Instead of each person bringing their own *korban chatat* for violating the prohibition in error, one bull is brought by the *Sanhedrin* instead.

The second *perek* begins with a similar *korban* that is brought by a *kohen gadol* in a similar circumstance. If the *kohen gadol* rules for himself in error, and then violates the prohibition based on that ruling, then he must similarly bring a special *korban*.

The *Mishnah* (2:2) however teaches that if the *kohen* rules in error alongside the *tzibbur*, then the *kohen* achieves his atonement with the *par helem davar shel tzibur* and does not need to bring his own *korban*.

Rashi (7a) explains that the case in the *Mishnah* is where the *kohen gadol* ruled regarding the same prohibition in error just like the *Sanhedrin* did. *Rashi* adds that the continuation of the *Mishnah* justifies this point. Why can the *kohen*'s transgression be atoned for with the *korban tzibur*? It is because the conditions under which the *korban* must be brought is the same in both circumstances. *Rashi* therefore explains that that when the *Mishnah* teaches that the *kohen* is liable to bring his own *korban* if he ruled "on his own", it does not mean that the *Sanhedrin* did not rule at all, but rather that the *kohen* ruled regarding a different prohibition.

The *Aruch HaShulchan* (*Ha'Atid Shegagot* 229:8) asks why according to *Rashi*'s understanding, do we need that justification from the continuation of the *Mishnah*. The *Beraita* in the *Gemara* learns this from a *pasuk*, that the *kohen* brings this *korban* to atone "for the sin that he committed". The *Par Kohen Mashiach* is applicable when he sins on his own, but not when he sins along with the *tzibur*.

The *Aruch HaShulchan* explains that it was necessary for the case where the prohibition related to *avodah zara*. In that case the *korban* that a *kohen* would bring is different to the

tzibur. Nevertheless, since the conditions in which they are brought are the same, it does not change the ruling from the *beraita*. It is important then to understand that *Rashi*'s position is primarily based on the *pasuk* and not only the technical similarities between the two *korbanot*.

The *Bartenura* however explains that the case in the *Mishnah* is where the *kohen gadol* was one of the *dayanim* on the *Sanhedrin* that presented the ruling. The *Bartenura* explains that one might have thought, that just like on *Yom Kippur* the *kohen gadol* achieves his atonement through his own independent *korban*, the same would be true in this case also.

The *Rambam* (*Shegagot* 15:2) rules that the *kohen gadol* is obligated to bring his own *korban* if he acted solely based on his own ruling. If however it was also based on the *Beit Din*'s ruling, he would be exempt.

The *Lechem Mishnah* however asks that based on the *beraita* above, whose ruling he considered at the time he sinned should be irrelevant. It should simply be whether he sinned alongside the *tzibbur*.

The *Aruch HaShulchan* (*Ha'Atid Shegagot* 229:11) explains that the *Gemara* notes for the case in the *Mishnah* to makes sense – that there are two rulings – the *kohen* and *beit din* must be of equal standings in wisdom. Were it not the case, then one's ruling would not be a consideration relative to the other. The *Aruch HaShulchan* continues that the *Rambam* rules (*Sanhedrin* 2) that it is a *mitzvah* for the *Sanhedrin* to ideally include *kohanim* and *leviim*. The *Sifri* continues that the *kohen gadol* should also be included in the *Sanhedrin* if he is knowledgeable enough. Considering the above, the case in our *Mishnah* must be that the *kohen gadol* ruled on the *Sanhedrin* (as the *Bartenura* explained). Consequently, the *Rambam* is effectively explaining the reason behind the *pasuk*. Why is the *kohen gadol* atoned for with the *par helem davar*? Because at the time he did not rely on his own ruling along, since it must be that he sat on the *Sanhedrin* and came to the conclusion together with them.

Revision Questions

אבות ו' י"א

- For what purpose was everything created? (ו' י"א)

הוריות א' א' – ג' א'

- If one acted according to the mistaken ruling of *Beit Din*, what is the general rule regarding when he is obligated to bring a *korban chatat* and when he is exempt? (א' א')
- What are the two opinions regarding a person who acted according to a mistaken ruling of *Beit Din* but was unaware that *Beit Din* actually retracted that ruling? (ב' א')
- When is *Beit Din* obligated to bring a *par he'lem davar shel tzibur*? (ג' א')
- What are some reasons regarding the people that sat on the *Beit Din* that ruled incorrectly, that would not qualify them to bring a *par*? (ד' א')
- Regarding a faulty ruling by *Beit Din*, when: (ד' א')
 - Does *Beit Din* bring a *par*?
 - Is everyone obligated to bring a *chatat*?
 - Everyone unable to bring a *korban*?
- What is the difference if *Beit Din* ruled incorrectly permitting *avodah zara*? (ה' א')
- What are the three opinions regarding how many sacrifices must be brought if a majority of the tribes acted in accordance with the mistaken ruling of *Beit Din*? (ה' א')
- According to who would this law even apply to a single tribe? (ה' א')
- When is a *kohen mashi'ach* obligated to bring a *par*? (ו' א')
- If a *kohen mashi'ach* acted in accordance with a mistaken ruling when can he be included in the communal sacrifice and when must he bring his own? (ו' ב')
- Complete the following rule: (ג' ב')

_____ אין חייבין אלא על _____ עם _____
- For which particular transgression is the *par he'lem davar shel tzibur* brought? (ז' ב')
- What other sacrifice applies to similar transgressions as a *par he'lem davar shel tzibur* and what are these transgressions? (ז' ב')
- Which transgressions, if inadvertently transgressed, are the subject of debate as to whether a "*nasi*" is obligated to bring a *korban*? (ח' ב')
- What animal do the following people bring if they inadvertently transgress a sin whose deliberate transgression is punishable with *karet* and whose inadvertent transgression obligates one to bring a *chatat*: (ח' ב')
 - An individual?
 - A "*nasi*"?
 - A *kohen mashi'ach*?
 - Beit din*?
- Regarding the previous question what if the transgression was one:
 - Involving *avodah zara*? (ט' ב')
 - Obligating one to bring an *asham talui*?
 - Obligating one to bring an *asham vadai*?
 - Involving accidentally entering the *Beit Ha'Mikdash* in a state of impurity? (י' ב')
- What is the law if a *kohen mashi'ach* committed a sin obligating him to bring a *par* but then was removed from his position? (י' א')

Shiurim

ONLINE SHIURIM

Yisrael Bankier
mishnahyomit.com/shiurim

Rabbi Reuven Spolter
mishnah.co

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

Rabbi E. Kornfeld
Rabbi C. Brown
http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm

APPS

Mishnah Yomit
mishnahyomit.com

All Mishnah
Orthodox Union

Mishna Yomi
Our Somayach, South Africa

Kehati

SHIUR
ON KOL HALOSHON

Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss
In US dial: 718 906 6400
Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
13 July י"ג תמוז	14 July י"ד תמוז	15 July ט"ו תמוז	16 July כ' תמוז	17 July כ"א תמוז	18 July כ"ב תמוז	19 July כ"ג תמוז
Horayot 3:2-3	Horayot 3:4-5	Horayot 3:6-7	Horayot 3:8 - Zevachim 1:1	Zevachim 1:2- 3	Zevachim 1:4- 2:1	Zevachim 2:2- 3

