

### *As a Communal Servant or as an Individual Civilian?*

The Torah tells us (-Leviticus 6:13) that the *Kohain Gadol* was obligated to bring a daily meal-offering upon the altar: *"This is the offering of Aaron and his sons, which they shall offer (-Menochos 50b 'from his home -own money') to the L-rd, on the day that he is anointed: One tenth (.35-.39 pounds) of an ephah (3.5-3.9 pounds) of fine flour for a 'tamid - continuous' meal offering, half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening."*

Our Sages (-Minochos 51b, Mishna) inquire as to what is the law if the *Kohain Gadol* brought the morning half, and died during the day, before bringing the evening half: *"If they did not appoint another Kohain Gadol in his stead, from whose (property) was it sacrificed? Rabbi Shimon says: From (the property) of the community. Rabbi Yehuda says: From the (property of) the heirs (of the deceased Kohain Gadol -Rashi: Until a new Kohain Gadol is appointed)."* The Talmud then explains that the reason for the opinions of Rabbi Shimon and Rabbi Yehuda come from the verse (-ibid, verse 15): *"And the priest who is anointed instead of him from among his sons, shall prepare it; [this is] an eternal ('olam - עולם': forever, world) statute; it shall be completely burnt to the L-rd":*

*"The verse states (-Leviticus 6:15): 'And the anointed priest that shall be in his stead from among his sons shall offer it... (this is) the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.'" Ritva explains that Rabbi Yehuda extrapolates the verse to mean: "And the anointed priest --if he dies-- from among his sons shall offer --the Kohain Gadol's Offering-- in his stead."*

*"Rabbi Shimon says: (The continuation of the verse:) "It is a statute forever [olam - עולם] (to the L-rd)," (teaches that in the case of a Kohain Gadol who died, and has not yet been replaced, the offering is brought) from (the property) of the world [olam - עולם], (i.e., the community)."*

From the language of the Mishna in the question, *"from whose was it sacrificed?,"* and from the language and opinions of the two Sages, it is clear that (Biblically speaking), it is not that the Torah instituted a new commandment for the *Kohain Gadol's Offering* being brought in the interim, until a new *Kohain Gadol* is appointed. Rather, it is the very mitzva that was upon the deceased Kohain Gadol, before he passed away, that is now driving the continuation of his offering, until a new *Kohain Gadol* is appointed. And the mitzva is now upon the new *Kohain Gadol, even after his demise, until the next *Kohain Gadol* is appointed. Thus, we see that the debate between Rabbi Shimon and Rabbi Yehuda over how to extrapolate this law from the verse, is in essence a debate over what the essence of the *Kohain Gadol's Offering* is (even as the *Kohain Gadol* brings the offering during the lifetime).*

While it is called the *"Kohain Gadol's Chavitin,"* meaning that it is his offering, and while this offering is to be brought from the *Kohain Gadol's* money, nevertheless, we are to explore whether this offering is of the category, *"Communal Offering,"* or *"Individual's Offering"*:

In enumerating the 613 Commandments, the *Sefer HaChinuch*, defines this mitzva (Mitzva #136) with:

*"It is from the roots of the commandment [that it is] because the Kohain Gadol is the agent between Israel and their Father in Heaven -meaning to say, that he is the one that carries prayer to Him for their sake; and through his prayers and the act of his sacrifices, they are atoned. And hence it is fitting that there be a private daily sacrifice for a man like this, like the daily sacrifices of the community.... And on account of this, he will be effective for himself and for them."*

This lends to the *"Kohain Gadol's Chavitin,"* being about communal atonement, just as that of the, *"daily sacrifices of the community,"* together with which, the *Kohain Gadol's Offering* is brought.

However, other commentaries, such as the *Abarbanel* on our verse, state:

*"The Kohain Gadol's offering of every day deserves that we give it a reason, And it seems that she has several reasons... And the 6<sup>th</sup> (reason), in order that he enter before G-d with humility and signs of poverty as the poor and destitute who stand before the L-rd of the whole earth... And the 9<sup>th</sup> (reason), the L-rd willed that every day there will be offerings before Him, an 'Individual's Offering' and a 'Communal Offering.' And the 'Communal Offering' for each day..., one lamb should be offered in the morning and the other lamb should be made between the evenings. And in order for it to be the same with an 'Individual Offering' it was ordered upon the Kohain Gadol... which is the most holy one in the community. that it (a 'Kohain Gadol's Offering') be that half of it should be in the morning and half of it should be in the evening. In such a way the Name (of G-d) will rise in 'general' (Communal Offering) and in 'detail' (Individual Offering)."*

Thus, the two opinions (concerning a *Kohain Gadol* who died, *"If they did not appoint another Kohain Gadol in his stead, from whose was it sacrificed?"*) will depend upon the two types of reasons for the '*Kohain Gadol's Offering*,' whether it is for the *community* or for the *Kohain Gadol himself*. If we are to say that the *Kohain Gadol's Offering* is a 'Communal Offering,' then when there is no *Kohain Gadol*, the community will have to bring it. However, if we are to say that it is an 'Individual Offering,' of the *Kohain Gadol*, then it now needs to be brought by his inheritors.

\* \* \*

With this explanation of the '*Kohain Gadol's Offering*' being for the *Kohain Gadol* as an *individual*, we will be able to explain the wording of Maimonides upon this law (-Laws of *Tmidim* and *Musafin* 3:22): *"If the Kohain Gadol died in the morning after he offered the half of an isaron (lit., 10<sup>th</sup>, referring to the '10th of an ephah') and another [High] Priest was not appointed, the heirs (of the first) should bring an entire isaron as his (Kohain Gadol's) atonement."*

What is Maimonides' point in saying, *"as his atonement"*? Additionally, what is his source for this? However, Maimonides is stating this in order to give us the reason as to why it is *"the inheritors bring"* the offering. Being that the offering is their father's personal, *"as his atonement."*

Additionally, Rabbi Yehuda, in his ruling, changes from the word of the verse, “from among his sons, shall prepare it,” and states, “inheritors,” in which Rabbi Yehuda is telling us that even though it is the male *kohanim* who perform offerings, nevertheless, if the *Kohain Gadol* who died had only daughters, the “inheritors” (the daughters) have to bring the offering. With this too, Maimonides is explaining that Rabbi Yehuda extrapolates this because this offering is about, “his atonement,” explaining that the inheritors are not bringing a new concept, “The Inheritors of a Kohain Gadol’s Offering,” but are bringing their father’s offering for him.

\* \* \*

By understanding that the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is a kind of *Communal Offering*, while also being an *Individual Offering*, we can understand Rashi’s commentaries on the verses (-Leviticus 6:15-16), “And the kohain who is anointed instead of him from among his sons, shall prepare it; [this is] an eternal statute; it shall be completely burnt to the L-rd. Every meal offering of a kohain shall be a whole (offering); it shall not be eaten”:

1. ‘who is anointed instead of him from among his sons’: who is anointed from among his sons instead of him.
2. ‘It shall be completely burnt’: There is no *kemitza* - קְמִיצָה (handful) procedure to enable any remainder to be eaten; but, it is burnt in its entirety.
3. ‘whole’: (Heb. *kolil* - כָּלִיל, also from *kol* - כֹּל, meaning ‘all’) All of it must be equally offered to (G-d on) High.

Questions:

- (i) In his first commentary, what is Rashi’s intentions with just reorganizing the words of the verse?
- (ii) In the second Rashi, why does Rashi need to teach us the intention of a simple known word *kolil*, that it means, “it is burnt in its entirety,” and that obviously, “There is no... remainder to be eaten”? Rashi himself previously (-ibid, verse 7) uses the word *kolil*, and feels no need to explain it?!
- (iii) In the third commentary Rashi explains the very meaning of the word itself (*kolil* - *kulo*). Hence, the first time (-verse 7) Rashi explains nothing. The second time (-verse 15) he explains the intention (“There is no *kemitza*...”). And now (-verse 16) Rashi explains the simple definition of the word?!

*The Explanation:* Rashi is dealing with a specific question upon the verses, concerning the difference in their language:

Verse 15: “And the kohain who is anointed... it shall be completely burnt (כָּלִיל תִּקְטַר) to the L-rd.”

Verse 16: “Every meal offering of a kohain shall be a whole (offering) (כָּלִיל תְּהִיָּה), it shall not be eaten.”

Thus, Rashi understands that there are two types of *kolil* (1. “Completely burnt.” 2. “Shall be a whole offering.”):

*Kohain who is Anointed (Kohain Gadol): Completely burnt - כָּלִיל תִּקְטַר* is, “The *kemitza* procedure is, not to enable any remainder to be eaten, but, it is burnt in its entirety.” And Rashi elaborates that he does not mean that a *kemitza* is not done, but rather, the *kemitza* itself is also burnt on the altar. (-Menochos 74a), “The *kemitza* handful is sacrificed by itself, and the remainder is sacrificed by itself.”

*Kohain (Plain Kohain): Shall be a whole* (offering) - כָּלִיל תְּהִיָּה is, “All of it be equally offered to (G-d on) High.” Meaning that all of it, *kemitza* and *remainders*, are offered together as one, that it be offered in its *being-ness* (“shall be - תְּהִיָּה”), as it is.

The difference between the offering of the *Kohain Gadol* and of the plain *kohain* is understood through that which we explained above: “*Kohain Gadol’s Offering is a kind of Communal Offering, while also being an Individual Offering.*” While the plain *kohain’s* offering is only an *Individual Offering*. Therefore, when it comes to the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering*, which is not a *kohain* offering --which would have not needed a *kemitza* performed, but rather, is a *Communal Offering* --which does need a *kemitza* performed, mandates that there be a *kemitza*. However, being that the one offering the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is a *kohain*, and hence, this is also a *Kohain’s Offering*, and therefore, cannot be eaten from, thus, the *kemitza* is offered on the altar separately, as a kemitza that cannot be eaten.

This is the reason for Rashi’s first-comment’s reorganizing the words of the verse (“who is anointed instead of him from among his sons”: who is anointed from among his sons instead of him”), telling us that the “Simple Meaning of the Scripture” does not tolerate Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion. Rabbi Yehuda extrapolates from the verse that the words “of his sons - מִבְּנָיו” and “instead of him - תַּחְתָּיו” are not connected to the word “who is anointed - הַמְּשִׁיחַ,” but to the word “shall offer - יַעֲשֶׂה.” Hence, he sees the verse stating, “And the anointed priest --if he dies, then-- from among his sons shall offer --the Kohain Gadol’s offering-- in his stead.” Even though this extrapolation is obviously far from the simple meaning, nevertheless, Rashi feels that he best clearly exclude it from the simple meaning. Being that the verse places the order of the words as, “instead of him from among his sons - תַּחְתָּיו מִבְּנָיו,” instead of, “from among his sons instead of him - מִבְּנָיו תַּחְתָּיו,” therefore, a student may think that with this choice of word-order the Torah is alluding to teaching us (besides the simple meaning that the next appointed (and so on, for all generations) *Kohain Gadol* needs to bring a *Kohain Gadol’s Offering*) that until a new *Kohain Gadol* is appointed, that the *inheritors* of the deceased *Kohain Gadol* need to bring the daily *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* for their deceased father. Hence, Rashi clarifies that this is not in sync with the simple meaning of the Scripture, by telling us to read the verse as, “[The kohain (הַמְּשִׁיחַ)-who is anointed, (תַּחְתָּיו מִבְּנָיו)-from among his sons instead of him shall prepare it....” However, important to note that Rashi sees the word “his son - מִבְּנָיו” not to mean just any son, being that Rashi’s opinion is, as stated before, that the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is an atonement for the community, and is brought by the *Kohain Gadol* as an emissary of the community. Thus, it is unbecoming for this offering to be brought by a son who is not a *Kohain Gadol*, nor is an emissary of the community. thus it must be brought by the specific son who became *Kohain Gadol*. --In the unique case of there being an interim between the death of a *Kohain Gadol* and the appointment of a new *Kohain Gadol*, Rashi would rule, from the perspective of the “Simple Meaning of the Scripture” that it is to be brought from the community.

\* \* \*

We explained earlier that the dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon is based upon their difference in opinion upon what the essence of the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is. With this we can explain yet another detail in which Rabbi Yehuda and

Rabbi Shimon differ concerning this offering. The Talmud (-Menochos 51b) goes on to question, “*And what does Rabbi Yehuda do with that phrase: “It is a statute forever (olam) to the L-rd,”* --from which Rabbi Shimon derives that it is brought from communal (*olam*) resources, being that Rabbi Yehuda holds that it is brought from the inheritors? And the Talmud answers: “(It teaches that the statute requiring the High Priest to sacrifice the offering) *is to apply forever* (every day of every generation that we have the Temple).”

*Tosafot* (-ibid, d”h *Choik*) explains Rabbi Yehuda’s need for this teaching, being that we might have thought, being that while Aharon (who was *never* inaugurated as a *plain kohain*, but only as a *Kohain Gadol*, and therefore) had to bring the daily *Kohain Gadol’s Offering*, however, Aharon’s sons (*plain kohanim*) --who were already previously inaugurated by bringing the *Plain Kohain’s Offering*, and therefore--, would *not* have to bring a daily *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* upon being appointed as a *Kohain Gadol*. Hence, the verse specifies, “*It is a statute forever to the L-rd,*” for *every Kohain Gadol* of *every* generation, even if he was already inaugurated with a *Plain Kohain’s Offering*. *Tosfos* then concludes that Rabbi Shimon (who derives from this phrase to teach us that it is brought from *communal* resources, and therefore, cannot use it for the teaching that the offering must be offered by every *Kohain Gadol* of every generation) doesn’t hold of this logic (we would think that a future *Kohain Gadol* would *not* have to bring the daily *Kohain Gadol* offering, due to being previously inaugurated by offering, as a *plain kohain*), and hence, needs no special phrase in the verse to *negate* such a thought.

Let us understand even deeper yet, as to why Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon disagree on whether, or not, there has to be a special teaching from the verse that the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* needs to be brought every day for all generations (that we have the Temple): Rabbi Shimon is of the opinion that the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is a *Communal Offering*, and (-Horayos 6a), “*There is no death with regard to a congregation* (the entity of the congregation remains even when specific members die).” Therefore, it is self understood, *without* the need of a specific phrase in the verse, that just as the *community is eternal*, so too, a *Communal Offering is ‘tamid - continuous* (brought daily, throughout all generations)’. Rabbi Yehuda, however, sees the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* as an *Individual Offering*, and we do not find elsewhere that an *Individual Offering* is “*tamid -continuous*”. Thus, the need for a specific phrase teaching us that *this Individual Offering is ‘tamid -continuous*”.

\* \* \*

The above stated difference between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon is not *just* on whether a special phrase in the verse is needed, or is not needed (in order to teach us that *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is ‘*tamid -continuous*’). Rather, here too, the difference lay within their opinion of what ‘*category*’ of ‘*tamid -continuous*’ this offering has. The definition of a *Communal Offering* being ‘*tamid -continuous*’ is not that every day there is an *additional* daily obligation to bring the offering. Rather, it is the very first obligation of the very first offering that is *one ongoing* ‘*tamid -continuous*’ obligation. So too, it is with the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering*, according to Rabbi Shimon, in seeing this offering as a *Communal Offering*, it is but *one ongoing* daily ‘*tamid -continuous*’ obligation for all generations. However, according to Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion of the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering* being an *Individual Offering*, and hence, there is not the eternality of, “*There is no death with regard to a congregation,*” thus, the ‘*tamid -continuous*’ obligation is *not* an *ongoing one*, but rather, it is a “*Continuous Offering*” in which the obligation ‘continuously’ *renews* itself daily.

\* \* \*

And it is with this insight to the *Kohain Gadol’s Offering’s* ‘*tamid -continuous*’ category, that we can understand the teaching of the *Torat Kohanim* upon the verse (-Leviticus 6:13), “*This is the offering of Aaron and his sons... a ‘tamid -continuous’ meal offering*”:

“*on the day that he is anointed: From the day that he is anointed he brings the tenth of an ephah, ‘tamid -continuous’. But perhaps it means: On that day he brings a tenth of an ephah, and stops! It is, therefore, (to negate the latter) written, ‘a meal-offering ‘tamid -continuous’.*’ How, then, am I to satisfy, ‘On the day that he is anointed?’ On that day he brings a tenth of an ephah (and he does so) forever (‘*tamid -continuous*’).”

What is the *Torat Kohanim’s* answer that from, “*On the day that he is anointed,*” we learn that, “*On that day he brings... forever,*” when we can clearly learn that the obligation is from, “*On the day that he is anointed,*” until, “*forever,*” from the words, “*a ‘tamid -continuous’ meal offering*”?! However, in lieu with the new understanding of the ‘*tamid -continuous*’ category of *this* offering, we see that the *Torat Kohanim* is teaching us a *law* by extrapolating the ‘*tamid -continuous*’ specifically from the words, “*On the day that he is anointed.*” The *daily Kohain Gadol’s Offering* is a daily, “*he is anointed,*” of the *Kohain Gadol!* And just like by the *first*, “*he is anointed,*” it was forbidden for the *Kohain Gadol* to do *any* service *prior* to his being *anointed*, so too, daily, it is forbidden for the *Kohain Gadol* to do *any* service *prior* to his daily, “*he is anointed,*” by that day’s *Kohain Gadol Offering*.

\* \* \*

This understanding of the opinion, that it is (i) an *Individual Offering*, (ii) that, “*the day that he is anointed,*” is ‘*tamid - continuous*’, and (iii) in the category of, every single day *anew* there is the obligation of being, “*he is anointed,*” this coincides with the *Chassidic Parsha* (teachings) of this Torah-portion (*Tzav*):

“*Seemingly, the verse should have said, ‘From the day that he was anointed,’* instead of, ‘*On the day that he was anointed*’?”

However, the reason that the verse states, “*On the day that he was anointed,*” is:

“*In order that there be every single day, forever, the (spiritual) aspect and level of that, “On the day that he was anointed.”*”

And the teaching continues with explaining that this which is stated, “*Upon the offering of Aharon, the (spiritual) aspect and level of, ‘On the day that he was anointed,’*” refers to the, “*Offering of Aharon’s, ‘Tamid - Continuous Offering,’ of forever,*” and nevertheless, this daily offering is *forever* --each and every day--, of the “*aspect and concept*” of, “*On the day that he was anointed.*”

This coincides with our understanding of the (i) *tamid-continuous* category is of a daily *anew* (ii) obligation, of the very, “*on the day that he was anointed,*” and thus, is the *Kohain Gadol’s ‘being anointed,’ anew, on, and for, that very day, ever day.*”